



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Nedarim, Daf לב – Daf לה

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לב---32-----

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehoshua ben Korcha** said, milah is so great as we see that all of Moshe Rabbeinu's merits did not protect him from punishment when he delayed giving his son a bris milah. **Rebbi** said, chas v'shalom to say that Moshe delayed in giving the bris. Rather, when his son Eliezer was born he was unsure what to do. He didn't want to give him the bris, because Hashem had just told him to go to Mitzrayim, and traveling after having the bris would have been a danger for the baby. He could not give the bris and delay going to Mitzrayim, because Hashem told him to go! Instead, he began to travel and delayed giving the bris. The reason he was punished was, that when he got to his point of travel he first worried about finding a place to stay before doing the bris immediately. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, it was not Moshe who the Malach tried to kill, rather it was the baby Eliezer.
  - **R' Yehuda bar Bizna** said, when Moshe delayed doing the milah to his son, the Malachim of "Ahf" and "Cheimah" swallowed him up, leaving out only his milah. When Tziporah saw this she took a sharp stone and gave a bris milah to their son. The Malachim then let go of Moshe. Moshe wanted to kill those Malachim at that point. Others say that he actually did.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says that milah is so great, because no one did mitzvos like Avrohom Avinu, and he was not called complete until he had a bris milah. Another drasha based on a pasuk is that milah is equal to all of the Torah. Another drasha based on a pasuk is, that if not for the mitzvah of bris milah, Hashem would not have created His world.
  - **R' Elazar** said, this last pasuk refers to Torah, and Torah is the reason Hashem created His world.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, when Hashem told Avrohom "Walk before Me and be complete", Avrohom trembled, thinking that maybe there was something wrong with him. When he then understood that Hashem was referring to bris milah, he calmed down.
  - The pasuk says that Hashem took Avrohom "outside". The Gemara says, Avrohom said to Hashem "My mazel based on the stars tells me that I will not have another son". Hashem told him, "Go out from your star gazing, because Yidden are not bound by mazel".
- **R' Yitzchak** darshens a pasuk to teach that one who totally relies on Hashem will merit to have Hashem act in a way that will justify the reliance. **R' Hoshaya** said, one who does so will merit to ascend to greatness. **Rebbi** said, one who needs assurance of the future will not get a favorable result. **Ahava the son of R' Zeira** said, one who doesn't seek assurances for the future is put in an especially close place to Hashem.
- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Elazar** said, Avrohom was punished in that his children were enslaved in Mitzrayim for 210 years, because he used talmidei chachomim to help him fight the war against the 4 kings. **Shmuel** said, it was because he asked Hashem for proof of His statement. **R' Yochanan** said, it was because he gave up a chance to take all the Sedom prisoners and to teach them to serve Hashem.
  - The pasuk says "vayarek". **Rav** darshened this to mean that Avrohom "emptied" these people from Torah by having them come and fight with him. **Shmuel** said, it means that Avrohom had to entice them with gold.
  - The pasuk says that Avrohom took 318 people with him. **R' Ami bar Abba** said, Eliezer was equivalent to all these people. **Others** say that he only took Eliezer, whose name is gematriya 318.
  - **R' Ami bar Abba** said, Avrohom was 3 years old when realized the existence of Hashem. The pasuk says "eikev" that Avrohom listened to Hashem, and eikev equals 172. Avrohom lived to 175, which means that the first 3 years he didn't know of Hashem.
  - **R' Ami bar Abba** said, the word "haSatan" equals 364, to teach that there is one day a year that the Satan does not have power over us. This one day is Yom Kippur (Ran).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ami bar Abba** said, the letter “hey” was added to Avrom’s name. This is because initially Avrom was master over 243 limbs (the gematriya of his name). When he became Avrohom, he became master over all 248 limbs. The last 5 were the 2 eyes, the 2 ears, and the eiver.
- **R' Ami bar Abba** explained a mashal from Koheles about a city, its enemies taking siege, and a wise man who used wisdom to save the city. He said, this refers to the body, the enemy being the Yetzer Harah, the siege being the aveiros, the wise man being the Yetzer Tov, and the wisdom being teshuva and good deeds.
- A pasuk says that wisdom strengthens the wise more than 10 rulers. This refers to teshuva and good deeds, which strengthen a person more than his 2 eyes, 2 ears, 2 hands, 2 feet, eiver, and mouth.
- **R' Zecharya in the name of R' Yishmael** said, initially Hashem was going to have the Kohanim come from the descendants of Shem. However, after the war with the kings, he first blessed Avrohom and only then blessed Hashem. After that, Hashem said that the Kohanim will come from Avrohom (although Avrohom came from Shem, it was now in the zechus of Avrohom that the Kohanim came from him, and no longer in the zechus of Shem – Ran).

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK ARBA'AH NEDARIM!!!

-----Daf ל"ג---33-----

### PEREK EIN BEIN HAMUDAR -- PEREK REVI'I

#### MISHNA

- There is no difference between one who makes a neder not to have any benefit from his friend, or one who makes a neder not to benefit from his friend’s food, except that the first person may not even walk through the friend’s property or use keilim that are not used to prepare food.
- If a person makes a neder prohibiting his friend from benefitting from his food, he may not lend his friend a flour sifter, a grain sifter, a mill, or an oven. However, he may lend him a shirt, a ring, a talis, or earrings.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Who is the Tanna who says that walking through someone’s property is considered to be a benefit? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** said it is **R' Eliezer**, who says in a Braisa that when a seller adds items above the amount paid for, it is considered a benefit and would be assur if the buyer may not have benefit from the seller (e.g. after measuring a pound of apples the seller adds a few extra).

#### HAMUDAR MAACHAL MEICHAVEIRO LO YASHILENU...

- **Q:** The neder was made regarding food, so why are the keilim assur to be lent as well? **A: Reish Laskish** said, the case is where he made a neder saying “the benefit of your food is assur to me” (the extra words of “the benefit” show that he meant to make assur more than just the actual food – Ran).
  - **Q:** Maybe that language meant to make assur even just chewing wheat to use to heal a wound!? **A: Rava** said, the case is where he says “a benefit that brings to the eating of your food is assur to me”. In that case, he meant to make the food keilim assur as well.
- **R' Pappa** said, a sack to carry fruit, a donkey to carry the fruit, and even any basket, are considered to be a benefit that brings to the eating of food.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, what about a horse that is used to take someone to a party or a ring that he wants to wear to a party, are these considered benefit for food as well? **Q2:** What about taking a shortcut through someone’s property to get to a party? **A:** Our Mishna permits the lending of a ring. This must be talking about a case of where he needed this for a party, because if not, it would be obvious that it would be mutar. Still, we see that it would be mutar!
    - **Q:** It may be that it was not needed for a party, and the only reason the Mishna says it is mutar is because the Mishna begins with a list of things that are assur, so it ends with a list of things that are mutar.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- Regarding all keilim that are not used in food preparation, if these keilim are normally rented out, they may not be lent to the person who is assur to benefit from the lender.

## GEMARA

- This suggests that the earlier Mishna prohibited lending items even if they are not typically lent. **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, this follows **R' Eliezer** (as explained above).

## MISHNA

- If one made a neder not to benefit from his friend, the friend may pay for his machtzis hashekel obligation, may repay a loan for him, and may return a lost item to him. In a place where one who returns an item normally gets paid, if he refuses payment, the one who made the neder must take the value of the payment and give it to hekdesh.

## GEMARA

- The Mishna must hold that paying these financial obligations is the equivalent of chasing a lion away from someone, and is therefore mutar (he is not giving him anything, rather, he is preventing a loss). **R' Hoshaya** said, this follows the view of **Chanana**, who says in a Mishna that if a person goes overseas and his friend supports his wife while he is gone, the friend is not entitled to repayment for what he spent. **Rava** said, the Mishna can even follow those who argue on **Chanana** and say that the friend does get repaid, and the reason it is not considered a benefit in the Mishna is because the Mishna may be talking about where the loan had no due date, and as such there was no rush for the debtor to pay, and hence no benefit if the loan is paid for him.
  - **Rava** didn't say like **R' Hoshaya**, because **Rava** has the Mishna following everybody's view. **R' Hoshaya** didn't say like **Rava**, because he says that there is a gezeira that would not allow payment of such a loan as a concern that it would lead to payment of other loans (with a due date) as well.

-----Daf 77---34-----

## MACHZIR LO ES AVEIDASO

- There is a machlokes between **R' Ami** and **R' Assi**. One says that Shimon may return a lost object to Reuven only when it is Reuven who may not benefit from Shimon, because Reuven is actually not benefitting from Shimon. However, if Shimon may not benefit from Reuven, he may not return a lost item to Reuven, because he is benefitting in that if a person asks him for tzedaka while he is returning the item, he will not have to give anything to tzedakah, based on the fact that he is busy doing another mitzvah (this is referred to as the “perutah of **R' Yosef**”). That is a benefit, and he therefore may not return the item. The other one says that in either case he can return the item, because the case of the perutah of **R' Yosef** is not common.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says that in a place where one who returns a lost item normally gets paid, in this case the money will have to be given to hekdesh. Now, according to the first view (of either **R' Ami** or **R' Assi**) that when Shimon may not benefit from Reuven he may not return a lost item to Reuven, how could it get to a case of having to give the money to hekdesh, since he can't return the lost item altogether!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about a case where Reuven is assur to benefit from Shimon, and Shimon is refusing to take the money. The Mishna teaches that Reuven may not keep the money (that would be considered as benefitting from Shimon) and he therefore must give the money to hekdesh.
  - **Others** teach the machlokes between **R' Ami** and **R' Assi** as follows. One says, Shimon may return the lost item to Reuven only when it is Shimon who is assur to benefit for Reuven, because the case of the “perutah of **R' Yosef**” is uncommon. However, if Reuven is assur to benefit from Shimon, Shimon may not return an item to him, because Reuven thereby benefits from Shimon. The other one says that even in this second case he may return the item to Reuven, because the return of a lost item is not called a true benefit.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Gemara asks, according to the view that the Mishna is saying that when Reuven is assur to benefit from Shimon, Shimon may not return a lost item, and it is only where Shimon is assur to benefit from Reuven that he can return the item, why can't Shimon accept the money? It is simply in return for the time he spent finding the item and is not considered to be a benefit!? **A: Kashyeh.**
- **Rava** said, if there was a hefker loaf of bread and someone said, "That loaf should belong to hekdesch", and he then took the loaf to eat it, he is oiver me'ilah for the entire value of the loaf. However, if he took it to give as an inheritance to his sons, he is oiver me'ilah only for the value of the "toivas hana'ah" (the amount of benefit he gets from the appreciation of his sons for doing so).
  - **Q: R' Chiya bar Avin** asked **Rava**, if someone tells his friend, "My loaf of bread should be assur to you", and he then gives it to him as a gift, does he then become mutar in the bread (does the transfer of ownership nullify the neder)? On the one hand he said "**my** loaf of bread", and since it is no longer his, it should no longer be assur. On the other hand he said "should be assur to **you**", which makes this loaf like hekdesch on the friend forever. **A: Rava** said, it is assur even after he gives it over as a present, because that must be what was meant when he said "to **you**". Clearly it is assur before he gives it to him, because it is not yet his. He must have meant for it to be assur even when he gets it. If he didn't mean for this to encompass the case of when he gets it as a gift, what else could he have meant – that if Shimon steals it is should be assur? He wouldn't plan to worry about such a case.
    - **R' Chiya bar Avin** said, it may be that he meant that it is assur to him even if he invited Shimon to come and eat, he may still not eat from the bread. However, if it is gifted to Shimon, it may be that it becomes mutar in that case.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if Reuven asks Shimon to lend him an item (a cow, an ax, etc.) and Shimon responds "this item should be assur on you if I have more than one of these" (in trying to show that he truly has only one of these items and therefore can't lend it out), and it then turns out that he has more than one of them, the Halacha is that during Shimon's lifetime this item is assur to Reuven. However, if Shimon were to die, or if it was given to Reuven as a gift, it would be mutar. This refutes the Halacha of **Rava**!? **A: R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, the Braisa is discussing where it was first given to a third party, who then gave it to Reuven. In that case **Rava** would agree that it is permitted.
      - **R' Ashi** said, we can see this from the wording of the Braisa as well. The Braisa says "or if it was given to him as a gift" and doesn't say that Shimon gave it to him as a gift.

### -----Daf 77-----35-----

- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, is there a Halacha of me'ila on an object that one makes as a "korbon" with a neder? **A: R' Nachman** said, our Mishna says that in a place when money is given to one who returns a lost object, the money should be given to hekdesch (since the person can't keep the money due to the neder that was made). This shows that the neder is like hekdesch, because the Mishna says that the money should go to hekdesch (rather than saying it should be destroyed by throwing it into the sea, like it says in other places).
  - The Gemara shows that the answer to this question is actually a machlokes between **R' Meir and the Chachomim** in a Braisa.
  - **R' Acha the son of R' Avya** asked **R' Ashi** (assuming there is me'ila on the item of a neder), if someone says to his friend "My loaf of bread is assur to you", and then gives it to this friend as a gift, who would transgress me'ilah? It can't be the one who made the neder, because the bread is not assur to him. It also can't be the recipient of the gift, because he would say that had he known it was assur he would never have accepted it!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the recipient will transgress me'ilah when he uses the bread, because even one who uses hekdesch by mistake is oiver for me'ilah. Therefore, he would be oiver for me'ilah as well.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- One who is assur to benefit from another based on a neder may have the one he is assur to benefit from separate his terumah and maaser with his knowledge, may have him offer his bird offerings for a zav, zava, or a yoledes, may have him offer the chataos and the ashamos, may have him teach him medrash, halachos and aggados, but he may not have him teach him Mikra. Still, he may have him teach his children even Mikra.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** They asked, when Kohanim offer the Korbanos of others, are they doing so as sheluchim of the people who are bringing the korbanos or are they considered sheluchim of Hashem? The difference would be if they are subject to a neder not to benefit a particular person. If that person then brings a korbon, if the Kohanim are considered to be the shaliach for that person they may not offer the korbon for that person. **A:** Our Mishna says that the one who is assur based on a neder *may* offer the birds for the person. It must be that the Kohen is considered to be the shaliach of Hashem.
  - **Q:** If so, why does the Mishna not simply say that he may bring all korbanos for him (and instead it lists certain korbanos)? It must be that the korbanos of those who need the korbon to bring about a kaparah are different, and only those korbanos may such a person offer for the one he is assur to give benefit to. As we see that **R' Yochanan** said that such korbanos (of one needing it for a kaparah) may even be brought without the owner's consent, based on the words "zos Toras hazav", which teaches that it may even be brought for a minor (who are unable to give legal consent).
    - **Q:** How would **R' Yochanan** darshen the words of "zos Toras hayoledes", since it can't refer to a minor, because a minor cannot give birth!? **A:** That is used to teach that the korbon is brought even for a wife who is a shotah.
  - **Q:** **R' Simi bar Abba** asked, a Braisa says that a Kohen who may not benefit a particular person based on a neder may offer his chatas and his asham. This seems to refer to all chataos and ashamos, and proves that the Kohen may bring all korbanos for the person!? **A:** It could be referring specifically to the chatas and asham of a metzora, which based on the words of "zos tihiyeh Toras hametzora", applies to a minor as well. This would mean that it can be brought without consent and may therefore be brought by a Kohen who is assur to provide benefit to the person, even if the Kohen is considered to be his shaliach.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that the Kohen's bad intent can cause the korbon to become piggul. This must mean that the Kohen is the shaliach of Hashem, because if he is the shaliach of the person, the person should say, "I never made you a shaliach to have this bad intent", and therefore it should not become piggul, because he was not authorized for that!? **A:** The pasuk teaches that the Kohen's intent can create piggul in any event. Therefore, it may be that he is considered to be the shaliach of the person, and he can still make something piggul based on the pasuk.

### -----Daf 17---36-----

- We stated earlier that **R' Yochanan** said all korbanos must be brought with consent of the one bringing it, except for a korbon brought by one who needs the korbon to complete a kapara (mechusar kaparah), for we find that a person can even bring a korbon for a mechusar kapara who is a minor child.
  - **Q:** Why can't a person also bring a regular chatas for someone without his consent, since according to **R' Yehuda** a person may bring any korbon for his wife who is a shotah!? **A:** The case of **R' Yehuda** must only be referring to the korbanos of his wife after giving birth. It can't be referring to a regular chatas, because what would the case be? If she ate a piece of cheilev (requiring her to bring a korbon) while she was a shotah, she would not have to bring a korbon at all, because a shotah does not need to bring a korbon. If she ate it while she was normal and then became a shotah, we have learned that such a person would also not be chayuv to bring a korbon. Therefore, **R' Yehuda** must have been referring to the korbanos brought after childbirth.
  - **Q:** Why can't a person also bring a Korbon Pesach for someone without his consent, since we find that a person can bring a Korbon Pesach for his minor children (which shows that it does not need consent to be brought)? Yet we find that **R' Elazar** says that a Pesach brought without consent is meaningless!? **A:**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**R' Zeira** said, the chiyuv of having one's minor children included in the Korbon Pesach is not D'Oraisa, and as such it cannot serve as a basis to the bringing of korbanos without consent.

V'TOREIM ES TERUMOSAV...

- **Q:** They asked, if one wants to separate terumah from his own produce for the purpose of making the produce of his friend to become mutar, does this have to be done with the friend's consent or not? Maybe, since he benefits through this, he does not even need to consent, or maybe, since it is his mitzvah to do, he rather do it himself unless he gives explicit consent otherwise. **A:** Our Mishna says that if Reuven is assur to benefit Shimon, Reuven may still separate terumah for him with his consent. What is the case in the Mishna? If Reuven is separating from Shimon's produce for Shimon, and "with consent" means that Reuven is doing it on his own, that can't be, because who made Reuven a shaliach to do so? Maybe it means that he did so with the consent of Shimon? That also can't be, because then Reuven is benefitting Shimon by acting as his shaliach!? It must be that Reuven is separating from his own produce for Shimon's produce. Now, this can't be with Shimon's consent, because then he would be benefitting Shimon. It must be that he does not need Shimon's consent to do so, and with this we can answer the question.
  - The Gemara says this is no proof. The case of the Mishna may be where Reuven separates from Shimon's produce for Shimon's produce. The case is where Shimon made a general statement that whoever wants to separate the terumah for him may do so. That is considered "with consent", but is general enough that it would not be as if he made Reuven a shaliach, and would therefore not be a problem of benefitting from Reuven.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, if a person uses his own produce to separate terumah for his friend, who gets the "tovas hana'ah" to choose which Kohen to give the terumah to – the separator or the friend? On the one hand the separated produce belongs to the separator, and on the other hand, if not for the friend's produce, this separated produce would not have the status of terumah at all!? **A: R' Zeira** said, the pesukim put the words "giving" and "planting" next to each other to teach that the tovas hana'ah of giving belongs to the one who planted all the produce that brings about the terumah obligation (i.e. the friend).
  - **Q:** Our Mishna allows the separating of terumah for the friend who is assur to benefit from the separator. Now, if the friend gets the tovas hana'ah, he would be getting benefit from the separator, which would be assur! It must be that it is the separator who gets the tovas hana'ah!? **A:** We can say that the Mishna is talking about a case where Reuven uses Shimon's produce to separate terumah for the benefit of Shimon's produce. The "consent" of the Mishna means that Shimon made a general statement that whoever wants to separate the terumah for him may do so. That is considered "with consent", but is general enough that it would not be as if he made Reuven a shaliach, and would therefore not be a problem of benefitting from Reuven.
  - The Gemara says that **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** paskened that if one uses his own produce to separate terumah for the benefit of his friend's produce, the tovas hana'ah belongs to the separator.

-----Daf תל---37-----

MELAMDO MEDRASH HALACHOS V'AGADOS AVAL LO YILAMDENU MIKRA

- **Q:** He can't teach him Mikra because that benefits him, so why can he teach him Medrash? **A: Shmuel** said, the Mishna is talking about a place where a teacher of Mikra normally gets paid, but a teacher of Medrash does not.
  - The Mishna is also teaching that one may take money for teaching Mikra, but may never take money for teaching Medrash.
    - **Q:** This is learned from a pasuk, but the pasuk seems to make no difference between teaching Mikra or Medrash!? **A: Rav** said, that a teacher of Mikra (which is generally taught to young children) may take payment for his efforts to watch over the children. **R' Yochanan** said, he may take payment for teaching the proper reading of the pesukim with the "trop" (which is not D'Oraisa and is therefore not included in the pasuk that says it must be done for free).
      - **Q:** Our Mishna says he may not teach Mikra to the one who is assur via a neder. Now, this would not include the watching of children (presumably we are discussing adults),

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

so according to **Rav**, what free benefit is he receiving that makes it assur for him to learn Mikra? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where the one who is assur via the neder is a child.

- **Q:** The Mishna then says that although he can't be taught Mikra by the one who made the neder, his children may be taught Mikra. This means that the one assur from the neder can't be a child, because the Mishna talks about his children!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should say, if he is a child he may not be taught Mikra by the person who made the neder. However, if he is an adult, the person who made the neder may teach him and even his children Mikra.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, children may not be taught new material by a teacher on Shabbos, but may review material with the teacher on Shabbos. According to **R' Yochanan** this makes sense, because teaching the first time is the hard thing and that is what the teacher gets paid for. That is why he cannot do this on Shabbos, because one may not get paid for work done on Shabbos. However, according to **Rav**, that he gets paid for watching the children, the same watching happens when learning new things and when reviewing old things. If so, why can the teacher not teach new things on Shabbos but can review old things? **A:** Even according to **R' Yochanan** it should not be a problem to get paid for teaching the children new material on Shabbos, because a teacher typically does not get paid daily, and therefore he could get paid for teaching on Shabbos based on the Halacha of "havla'ah" (if he gets paid weekly, monthly, etc., the wages for Shabbos are not noticeable). The reason he may not teach new things is because we want the fathers of the children to spend more time with them enjoying the Shabbos. The reason has nothing to do with being paid for Shabbos, and therefore poses no difficulty to **Rav**. **A2:** **Another** answer is that the reason children shouldn't be taught something new on Shabbos is because they can't concentrate fully due to the excessive food that they eat on Shabbos, compared to the weekdays. Again, this has nothing to do with being paid for Shabbos, and therefore poses no difficulty to **Rav**.
- **R' Yochanan** doesn't say like **Rav**, because he says that earning a wage for watching the children only applies to boys, however girls do not need to be watched and there would be no reason to pay the teacher if this was the reason. **Rav** doesn't say like **R' Yochanan**, because he says that the proper reading of the pesukim with the "trop" is D'Oraisa, and is therefore covered by the pasuk which says that the teaching of Mikra must be done without being paid. We find that **Rav** says this elsewhere as well.
  - The Gemara brings a statement of **R' Yitzchak** that the correct pronunciation of the words of the Nevi'im, the words that seem unnecessary but add to the stylistic writings, the words that are read but are not written, and the words that are written but not read, are all based on Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. The Gemara then gives examples of these categories.

### -----Daf פל--38-----

- **R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** said, Moshe became wealthy only from the leftover stone of the second Luchos, as the pasuk says "Pesal lecha" – the leftovers should be for you.
  - **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, initially the Torah was only give to Moshe, as the pasuk says "kesav lecha". Moshe acted generously and gave it to all of Klal Yisrael.
    - **Q: R' Chisda** asked, a pasuk says that Moshe says he was commanded to teach the Torah to all of Klal Yisrael!? **A:** The pasuk can be understood as saying "v'osi tzivah" – I was commanded about the Torah – and I then later gave it to all of Klal Yisrael.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Another pasuk seems to suggest that Moshe was commanded to teach the Torah to Klal Yisrael!? **A:** The pasuk can be understood as saying “kasher tzivisani” – I was commanded about the Torah – and I then later gave it to all of Klal Yisrael.
- **Q:** The pasuk says that Hashem told Moshe to write “this song” (i.e. the Torah) and teach it to the Yidden! **A:** That may have been referring to the song of Haazinu alone.
- **Q:** The pasuk says that Hashem said that the Torah serves as witness to Hashem about the Yidden, meaning that the Torah was given to all the Yidden!? **A:** The Torah was given to all Yidden, and the ability for deep understanding of the Torah was initially only given to Moshe. However, Moshe then went and gave that to all of Klal Yisrael as well.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, Hashem only rests His Shechina on a person who is strong, wealthy, wise, and humble, as we can learn from Moshe. Moshe was strong, as can be seen that he was able to carry and throw down the Luchos. He was wealthy, as we stated above. He was wise, as **Rav and Shmuel** said that Moshe had 49 out of the 50 levels of “binah”. He was humble, as the pasuk tells us.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, all the Nevi’im were wealthy, as can be seen from Moshe, Shmuel, Amos, and Yonah. Moshe, as was shown above. Shmuel, as **Rava** learns from a pasuk that he was wealthy. Amos, as is seen from **R’ Yosef’s** interpretation of a pasuk to mean that he was wealthy. Yonah, as **R’ Yochanan** said that when Yonah went onto the boat he paid the fare of everybody, which **R’ Rumanos** said was a tremendous amount of money.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, initially Moshe was taught the Torah and he forgot it. When that happened, Hashem gave it to him as a gift, and he was then able to retain it.

### MISHNA

- If Reuven makes a neder not to benefit Shimon, Reuven may still feed Shimon’s wife and children, even though Shimon is obligated to feed them (this benefits the wife and children and only tangentially benefits Shimon). However, Reuven may not feed any of Shimon’s animals (whether kosher or non-kosher, because that makes them more valuable, which is a true benefit to Shimon). **R’ Eliezer** says, he may feed the non-kosher animals, but not the kosher ones. They said to **R’ Eliezer**, why is there a difference between the kosher and non-kosher animals? He said, the kosher animal could eventually be eaten, and as such, fattening it provides a more direct benefit to Shimon. They said to **R’ Eliezer**, fattening the non-kosher animal also provides a direct benefit, because Shimon can sell the animal to a goy or give it to his dogs to eat.

### GEMARA

- **R’ Yitzchak bar Chananya in the name of R’ Huna** said, if one is assur to benefit from another based on a neder, he may marry off his daughter to him.
  - **Q:** **R’ Zeira** asked, what is the case? If it means that Reuven made a neder prohibiting Shimon to benefit from him, and that Shimon is allowed to marry Reuven’s daughter, that can’t be correct, because by giving his daughter, Reuven has in effect “given a maid” to Shimon (he now has someone to take care of his needs)!? It must be that what is meant is that Reuven is allowed to marry Shimon’s daughter. The chiddush is, that although Reuven now removes Shimon’s obligation to care for his daughter, this is not called a benefit. However, our Mishna already said an even greater chiddush than that! Our Mishna says that Reuven may even support Shimon’s children when they still live in his house!? **A:** The case of **R’ Huna** is, that Shimon is assur to benefit from Reuven, and yet he may marry Reuven’s daughter if she is already a bogeres, and therefore marries based on her own consent. Since it is her own consent, he is not considered to be benefitting from Reuven.
    - A Braisa says this as well.
- **R’ Yaakov** said, if a person makes a neder to prohibit benefitting from his son, so that his son should be free to learn and not have to tend to his father, the son may still fill a bottle of water and light a candle for his father. **R’ Yitzchak** said, he may even roast a small fish for him.
- **R’ Yirmiya in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, Reuven (based on the names of the example above) may give Shimon a “kos shel shalom” to drink.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- In Bavel they explained this to mean the cup of wine given to an avel. In Eretz Yisrael they explained this to mean the cup of hot water given to drink for someone who just went to a bathhouse.

V'LO YAZUN ES B'HEMTO BEIN...

- A Braisa says, **Yehoshua Ish Uza** said, Reuven may feed the non-Jewish slaves of Shimon, but may not feed any of his animals – whether kosher or non-kosher.
  - The Gemara explains, the difference is, a human is not eaten or sold for its meat, and therefore feeding his slaves brings no direct benefit to their owner. Animals are either eaten or can be sold for their meat. Therefore, feeding them is a direct benefit to their owner.