



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Sotah, Daf יז – Daf יח

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

-----Daf יח-----31-----

BO BAYOM DARASH R' YEHOShUA BEN HURKINAS...

- **Q:** Why can't we just look and see if the word "lo" in the pasuk (regarding lyuv) is written with a vuv (which would suggest that he served Hashem out of love) or with an aleph (which would suggest that it was done out of fear of punishment)? **A:** We find in other places that the word "lo" is written with an aleph and yet it is understood as if it was written with a vuv. Therefore, simply looking at how it is spelled will not be determinative of what is meant.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that lyuv was G-d fearing, and the pasuk says that Avrohom was G-d fearing. Just as Avrohom's fear was born out of his love for Hashem, the same is true for lyuv. We see this was the case by Avrohom, because the pasuk says "zerah Avrohom ohavi".
- **Q:** What is the difference in the zechus of one who serves Hashem out of love and one who serves Hashem out of fear? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, we darshen pesukim to teach that the reward for serving Hashem out of love lasts to protect his descendants in this world for 2,000 generations, whereas the reward for serving Hashem out of fear lasts for only 1,000 generations.
  - **Rava** had two talmidim who each had a dream. One was read a pasuk in his dream that discussed fearing Hashem, and the other was read a pasuk that discussed loving Hashem. **Rava** told them that they are both complete tzadikim, and the only difference is that one serves Hashem out of fear and the other serves Hashem out of love.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK K'SHEIM SHEHAMAYIM!!!**

**PEREK MI SHEKINEI -- PEREK SHISHI**

MISHNA

- If a man warned his wife not to seclude with a particular man and she then secluded herself with that man, **R' Eliezer** says, even if the husband hears about the seclusion from "a little birdie" (i.e. an unreliable source) he must divorce her (if he chooses not to give her the mei hamarim) and pay her the kesubah. **R' Yehoshua** says he does not need to divorce her until everybody is talking about her actions.
- If the seclusion was established (by 2 witnesses according to **R' Yehoshua**, or by "a birdie" according to **R' Eliezer**) and a single witness then came and said that he saw her be mezaneh, she is not given to drink (and would be divorced and would lose her kesubah). Moreover, even if that single witness is a slave or maidservant they are believed to the point of making her lose her kesubah. If the witness is her mother-in-law, or her mother-in-law's daughter, or her co-wife, or her husband's brother's wife, or her husband's daughter, they are believed to say she was mezneah and to prevent her from being able to drink the mei hamarim, but not to make her lose her kesubah.
  - We would think that a single witness would not be believed to say she was mezneah, because if two witnesses are needed to establish the seclusion, which only makes her *temporarily* assur to her husband, then for sure two witnesses should be needed to establish that she was mezneah, which makes her *permanently* assur to her husband! However, the Torah teaches that one witness is believed, when the pasuk says "v'eid ein bah" – which we understand to mean there are not two witnesses, but there is one witness.
  - Based on this we would think to say that a single witness should be believed to establish the seclusion!? However we have a gezeira shava that says differently. The pasuk regarding divorcing his wife says "ki

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

matza vah ervas davar”, and another pasuk says “ahl pi shnayim eidim yakum davar”. This gezeira shava teaches that two witnesses are needed to establish an “ervas davar”, which would include this matter of seclusion.

- If one witness says she was mezaneh and another witness says she was not, or if one woman says that she was and another says that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. If one said she was mezaneh and two said that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. If two said that she was mezaneh and one said that she was not, she is not given the waters to drink.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that a single witness is not believed regarding the seclusion based on a gezeirah shava. We learned earlier that a single witness is not believed for the kinuy or the stirah based on the word “bah” in the pasuk of “v’eid ein bah”!? **A:** The Mishna should be understood as if it said that regarding a kinuy and stirah a single witness is not believed based on the teaching of the word “bah”. Regarding other instances of zenus a single witness is not believed based on the gezeirah shava of “davar” “davar”.

### EID OMER NITMEIS

- The only reason the witness is not believed is because there is another witness that contradicts him. If not for that, the single witness would be believed. This is based on the pasuk of “v’eid ein bah”, and “eid” refers to two witnesses (so there were not 2 witnesses, but there was one).
  - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk means that there is no witness at all? **A:** This can’t be, because a pasuk says “lo yakum aid echad b’ish”. There is seemingly no reason to say the word “echad”. The pasuk does so to teach that whenever the pasuk says the word “eid” by itself it refers to two witnesses, unless the Torah adds the word “echad”.
  - **Q:** If the Torah believes the single witness who says that she was mezaneh, how can another single witness come along and contradict him? **Ulla** said, that wherever the Torah believes a single witness, that witness is given the status of two witnesses. If so, the witness who says she was mezaneh is considered as two, so how can a single witness contradict what he says and cause that he should not be fully believed? **A: Ulla** said, we must change the words of the Mishna to read that if another single witness comes and contradicts the first witness, the woman is not given the waters to drink (precisely because the first witness is believed). **R’ Yitzchak** gave this answer as well. **A2: R’ Chiya** said, the Mishna’s wording should not be changed, and **Ulla’s** halacha only applies if the single witness was already fully accepted by Beis Din before the other witness came. However, if the two came together, since the first was never fully accepted yet, he would not get the status of two witnesses.
    - **Q:** The Mishna said, if one witness said she was mezaneh and two said that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. Now, this suggests that if it was one against one she would not be given to drink, which is contrary to what **R’ Chiya** said!? **A: R’ Chiya** would answer, the later part of the Mishna suggests the opposite. The Mishna says if two witnesses say that she was mezaneh and one says that she was not, she is not given to drink. Now, this suggests that if it was one against one she would be given to drink. To explain this contradiction we must say that the Mishna is talking about witnesses who are normally passul (e.g. women, slaves, etc.), in which case **R’ Nechemya** says that we follow the side that has more people saying the testimony, even if it is two women against one man.
      - **Another version of R’ Nechemya** is that when we are dealing with witnesses who are otherwise passul, we follow the majority only when it is two women against one woman. However, if it was two women against one man it would be considered as if there was equal weight on both sides. According to this version, our Mishna is discussing where at first one woman came and said testimony, and then another two women came and contradicted her testimony.
      - According to this, both cases of this part of the Mishna are teaching regarding witnesses who are otherwise passul. The reason why we need two cases is that one teaches that

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

we follow the majority view if it will lead to a chumra, and the other case teaches that we follow this view even if it will lead to a leniency.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK MI SHEKINEI!!!**

-----Daf לב 32-----

**PEREK EILU NE'EMARIN -- PEREK SHEVI'I**

## MISHNA

- The following things may be said in any language: the sotah conversation (between the Kohen and the sotah), the viduy said on maaser (when he says that he has given what he was supposed to give), Kriyas Shema, tefilla (shmoneh esrei), birchas hamazon, the oath of testimony (when someone takes an oath that he is unaware of testimony for a case), and the oath of a shomer that he has not stolen the property he was supposed to be guarding),
- The following things must be said in Lashon Hakodesh: the passages read when bringing bikkurim, those said by chalitza, the brachos and klalos that were said on Har Grizim and Har Eival, birchas Kohanim, the brachos said by the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur, the readings and brachos said by the king at hakhel, the passages said by an egla arufa process, and the statements of the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchama when he talks to the people before going to war.
  - How do we know that these things must be said in Lashon Hakodesh?
    - Bikkurim – there is a gezeirah shava from bikkurim to the brachos and klalos, and we learn that just as they had to be said in Lashon Hakodesh, bikkurim must be said like this as well.
    - Chalitza - there is a gezeirah shava from chalitza to the brachos and klalos, and we learn that just as they had to be said in Lashon Hakodesh, chalitza must be said like this as well. **R' Yehuda** says, in the parsha of chalitza it says “kacha”, which teaches that it must be said exactly as it is written (in Lashon Hakodesh).
    - Brachos and Klalos – when the Yidden crossed the Yarden they went to Har Grizim and Har Eival which was near Shechem, also known as Eilonei Moreh, as we find that the pasuk discussing the travel of Avrohom refers to Shechem as Eilon Moreh. When they got there, six Shevatim went up on Har Grizim and six went up on Har Eival. The Kohanim, Levi'im and the Aron all remained in the valley, with the Aron in the middle, the Kohanim surrounding the Aron, and the Levi'im surrounding the Kohanim. They first turned to Har Grizim and called out the bracha and all the Yidden responded with “Amen!” They then turned to Har Eival and stated the klala and all the Yidden responded with “Amen!” Once all the brachos and klalos were completed, they brought large stones and built a Mizbe'ach, covered it with plaster and on it wrote the Torah in 70 languages (as the pasuk says “ba'er heiteiv” – explained well). They then took the stones and spent the night in Gilgal, where they set the stones in as a permanent remembrance for the miracles that took place.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the sotah conversation can be done in any language? **A:** The pasuk says, “v'amar HaKohen la'isha” – he “says” it in any language that he wants.
  - A Braisa says, they tell the sotah in any language that she understands: the reason that she is subject to the waters (for her behavior with the other man), what she drinks from, why she was mezaneh (if she was), and in what way her being mezaneh causes this death.
    - “the reason she is subject to the waters” – is because of the kinah and stirah
    - “what she drinks from” – a disgusting, earthenware keili
    - “why she was mezaneh” – because of light-heartedness and immaturity
    - “in what way she was mezaneh” – whether it was b'shogeig, b'meizid, b'oneis, or willingly

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- This is done so that if she was forced and the waters therefore don't work she will not think they would never work, but instead realizes that they don't punish for that zenus.

### VIDUY MAASER

- **Q:** How do we know that this viduy can be said in any language? **A:** The pasuk says "v'amarta..." and we have a gezeirah shava from sotah that teaches that it can also be said in any language.
  - **Q:** **R' Zvid** asked **Abaye**, why don't we instead learn the gezeirah shava from the "amira" of the Levi'im of the brachos and klalos, and learn that this viduy must also be said in Lashon HaKodesh? **A:** By sotah there is only verbiage of "amira" as there is by the viduy, whereas by the Levi'im there is verbiage of "v'anuv'amru", and therefore we learn from the more similar verbiage of sotah.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says, we see from the viduy of maaser that a person should say his own praise in a low voice (the pasuk doesn't say to say it loud – it doesn't use the word "v'anuv") and we learn from bikkurim that a person should say his own disgrace in a loud voice (the pasuk there does say "v'anisa", and the person then discusses how his ancestors worshipped idols).
  - **Q:** **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai** says that shmoneh esrei is to be said quietly so as not to embarrass the people who have done aveiros, and for this same reason the Torah says that an Olah and a Chatas are brought in the same location, so that on onlooker not know that the korbon is a Chatas!? We see that one should not announce his disgrace for all to hear!? **A:** The Braisa means that bikkurim is read aloud so that people hear of the troubles that our ancestors went through at the hands of Lavan. This teaches like a Braisa does, that one who has troubles should tell other people so that they daven for him to have his troubles alleviated.
    - **Q:** How can it be said that there is no recognizable difference between the Olah process and the Chatas process? The blood of each is put on a different part of the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** Only the Kohen knows where the blood is being put and what korbon it is. No one else can tell.
    - **Q:** The Chatas must be a female and the Olah must be a male, so it is plainly visible to all!? **A:** The tail of the Chatas blocks the female organs and therefore it can't be recognized whether it is a male or female.
    - **Q:** That is only true if a sheep is brought as a Chatas. What about when a goat (which doesn't have a tail that can cover her organs) is brought as a Chatas? **A:** A person who brings a goat brings the shame on himself, because he could have brought a sheep and spared himself the disgrace.
    - **Q:** The Chatas brought for worshipping avodah zara must be a goat, so how is his disgrace hidden? **A:** In that case he needs to be embarrassed as part of his kaparah.

### KRIYAS SHEMA

- **Q:** How do we know that Shema may be said in any language? **A:** The pasuk says "Shema Yisrael" – which teaches that it can be said in any language that the person understands.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says Shema must be read in Lashon Kodesh, based on the word "V'hayu", which means it must be read *this* way. The **Chachomim** say it can be read in any language, based on the word "Shema" which means in any language one understands.
  - The **Chachamim** say "V'hayu" teaches that one cannot read shema backwards, whereas **Rebbi** learns that from the "Hey" of "Hadivarim", and the **Rabanan** don't darshen the "hey".
  - **Rebbi** says the word "Shema" teaches that you must hear yourself read the shema, whereas the **Chachamim** say you don't need to hear yourself read the shema.
  - It may be that **Rebbi** would hold that all Torah readings must be done in Lashon Kodesh. Still, the Torah says "V'hayu" here so that one shouldn't expound like the **Chachomim** do on the word "Shema".
  - It may be that the **Chachomim** would hold that all Torah readings may be done in any language. Still, the Torah says "Shema" so that one shouldn't expound the "V'hayu" like **Rebbi** does.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Tefilla is asking for Hashem's mercy, so it is obvious that one may do so in any language.
- **Q:** We have learned that **R' Yehuda** says one should not daven in Aramis, because **R' Yochanan** says that the Malachim do not understand Aramis and will therefore not help to bring his tefilla to Hashem!? **A:** That is only when davening alone. However, when davening with a tzibbur one does not need the Malachim and may therefore daven in any language.
  - **Q:** We have learned of many instances when a bas kol spoke in Aramis, which would suggest that Malachim *do* understand Aramis!? **A:** Either we can say that a bas kol is different, because it is made for people to hear and understand and is therefore said in the common language, or we can say that the Malach Gavriel is the one who was behind the bas kol, and we find that he was fluent in all 70 languages.

### BIRCHAS HAMAZON

- The pasuk says "u'veirachta", which teaches that it may be said in any language.

### SHEVUAS HA'EIDUS

- The pasuk says "v'shama kol alah", which means it can be said in any language that the witness understands.

### SHEVUAS HAPIKADON

- We learn from a gezeira shava on the word "secheta" from shevuas ha'eidus, that it can be said in any language.

### V'EILU NEEMARIN B'LASHON HAKODESH...

- **Q:** How do we know that the Levi'im said the brachos and klalos in Lashon Hakodesh? **A:** It is learned via a gezeirah shava on the word "kol" from Moshe Rabbeinu at Matan Torah.

### CHALITZA KEITZAD...

- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** (the **T"K**) darshen the word "kacha"? **A:** They use it to teach that all acts of the chalitza process are essential to the validity of the chalitza.
  - **Q:** How does **R' Yehuda** (who uses "kacha" to teach that it must be said in Lashon Hakodesh) learn this? **A:** He says, the pasuk could have said "koh" and instead says "kacha", which allows for two drashos. The **Rabanan** don't darshen this drasha of "koh" to "kacha".
  - **Q:** What does **R' Yehuda** darshen with the words "v'ansa v'amra" (which the **Rabanan** used to teach that it needs to be said in Lashon Hakodesh)? **A:** He says that these words are needed for a gezeira shava from chalitza to teach that the Levi'im said the brachos and klalos in Lashon Kodesh.
    - **Q:** Why doesn't he learn this from the gezeirah shava of "kol" as the Gemara said earlier? **A:** He never had a kabbalah from his rabbei'im for a gezeirah shava on the word "kol".

### BRACHOS UKLALOS KEITZAD...

- A Braisa brings a machlokes between **R' Yehuda** and **R' Elazar**. **R' Yehuda** darshens the pesukim to mean that Har Grizim and Har Eival were far to the west of the Yarden, and were near Shechem. **R' Elazar** darshens the pesukim to mean that they were near the Yarden (not near Shechem). **R' Elazar** asked, that the pasuk says they were located in the plains, and Shechem was an area of mountains and valleys, not plains!? Also, the pasuk says that they were "opposite Gilgal", but Shechem is far away from Gilgal!? **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** answered, that the pasuk was Hashem's way of instructing the Yidden of the exact route to take after crossing the Yarden, and did not refer to the location of Har Grizim and Har Eival.

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

- A Braisa explains how the Yidden crossed the Yarden. We are taught by the pasuk that on every other day the Aron would travel after two of the "degalim", but on the day that we crossed the Yarden it led the way. On every other day the Levi'im carried the Aron, but on that day it was carried by the Kohanim. **R' Yose** says that there were 3 times when the Kohanim carried the Aron – when the Yidden crossed the Yarden, when they surrounded Yericho, and when the Aron was brought to the Beis Hamikdash. When the Kohanim carried the Aron to the Yarden, and the feet of the Kohanim went into the water, the water turned back from and stopped flowing to them, and instead built up as a wall of water. **R' Yehuda** said the wall of water grew to a size of 12x12 mil. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** said, that would mean that once the waters reached that high they began flowing again. That can't be right, because it took longer for the Yidden to cross over than for the water to reach

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

a height of 12 mil. Rather, he says that the water reached a height of greater than 300 mil, tall enough for all the kings of the east and west to see, as the pesukim tell us that all the kings were aware of the miracle of the Yarden. While still in the Yarden, Yehoshua said to the Yidden – “Know that Hashem has made this miracle so that you cross over the Yarden on the condition to drive out the goyim from the land and conquer it. If you will not do this, the water will come and wash us all away”. Yehoshua then told them to take 12 stones (corresponding to the 12 shevatim) and place them at the place where the feet of the Kohanim were in the water, to serve as a remembrance for future generations of the great miracle that took place. He then told them to take 12 stones from the area where the Kohanim’s feet were in the water and told them to carry them across the Yarden with them, and set them in the place where they will be spending that night. **R’ Yehuda** said, **Abba Chalafta**, **R’ Eliezer ben Masya**, and **Chananya ben Chachinai** saw these stones and estimated that each one was about 40 se’ah.

- The Gemara says, we have a kabbalah that a person can carry alone only 1/3 of what he can carry when someone else helps him. Based on this, we can learn how heavy the grapes of Eretz Yisrael were when the meraglim carried them back. We darshen the pasuk to teach that 8 meraglim carried one cluster of grapes (given that they helped each other, each one was able to bear a weight of 120 se’ah, which means that if 8 people were needed, the cluster weighed 960 se’ah), one carried a pomegranate, and one carried a fig. Yehoshua and Kalev did not carry any fruit, either because they were very chashuv and that was not befitting someone of their status, or because they were not part of the meraglim’s plan to disparage Eretz Yisrael.
- There is a machlokes between **R’ Ami** and **R’ Yitzchak Nafcha** – one says that **R’ Yehuda** holds the water only built up into a wall of 12 mil because the Yidden went through the Yarden in the same formation as when they camped (which filled an area of 12x12 mil) whereas **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** holds that they walked through the Yarden single file (which is why it took a lot longer and why the wall of water rose to over 300 mil), and the other says that they both agree that they crossed over in the same formation in which they camped, and **R’ Yehuda** holds that in the time it takes a formation of that size to cross over, the water would only build up to 12 mil, whereas **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** holds that because water travels so swiftly, in that amount of time the water would grow into a wall of over 300 mil.
- [Since we mentioned the meraglim, the Gemara now darshens some of the pesukim regarding the story of the meraglim]. The pasuk says “Shelach *lecha* anashim”. **Reish Lakish** said, Hashem told Moshe that He is not telling Moshe to send (since Hashem already said that the land was good there should have been no reason to verify that), rather Moshe was sending on his own.
  - The pasuk says “v’yachpiru lanu es haaretz” (the men should spy out the land). **R’ Chiya bar Abba** said, from the very beginning the meraglim only intended to shame Eretz Yisrael. This is taught by using the word “v’yachpiru” and we find another pasuk that says “v’chafra halevana” (and the moon will be shamed).
  - **R’ Yitzchak** said, we have a kabbalah that all the meraglim had names that spoke to their deeds, however we only remember the drasha regarding one of the meraglim – Sisur ben Michael. “Sisur” refers to the fact that he contradicted the words of Hashem, and “Michael” refers to that he tried to make Hashem seem as weak (that He couldn’t conquer the strong people of the land).
    - **R’ Yochanan** says we can darshen the name of “Nachbi ben Vuvs” – “Nachbi” – he concealed the words of Hashem by not saying the truth, and “Vuvs” means he stepped over the midos of Hashem by not saying the truth.
  - The pasuk says “They went up to the south and *he* came to Chevron”. The pasuk should say and “they” arrived, not “he”!? **Rava** said, this teaches that Kalev went alone to Chevron, to the Mearas Hamachpeila, to daven to Hashem that he not fall into the plan of the meraglim. Yehoshua did not have to go and daven for that, because Moshe already davened for him to be saved and added the letter “yud” to his name (which was originally Hoshei’ah). Kalev later received the city of Chevron in return for his righteousness.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The pasuk says that in Chevron there lived Achiman – so called because he was the most important of his brothers, Sheishai – so called because he would make ditches in the ground as he walked, due to being so large and heavy, and Talmai – so called because he would dig furrows with his feet as he walked. The pasuk says they were “yelidei anak” (the children of the giant), which is darshened to mean that they were so big that it looked like the sun was around their necks like a necklace.
- The pasuk says that Chevron was built seven years before Tzoan of Mitzrayim. Now, Knaan was a younger son of Cham than was Mitzrayim, so it doesn't make sense that Cham would build a city for his younger son before his older son!? Rather, it means that Chevron (which is from the rockiest and least plantable lands of Eretz Yisrael) was 7 times more fruitful than Tzoan of Mitzrayim (which is the best of lands in Mitzrayim).
  - Although we find that Chevron had the best sheep, presumably because of the grazing lands that they had there (which would mean that it had good land), it was good for grazing particularly because no one ever planted there (because the soil was very rocky).

### -----Daf ל"ה---35-----

- The pasuk says that they returned from spying out the land “vayeilchu vayavo'u” (and they went and came to Moshe). **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, this teaches that their going to Eretz Yisrael was with the same intent as their coming back. At both times their intent was to do bad and slander the land.
  - “Vayisapru lo vayomru banu...” – they began by saying some good attributes of Eretz Yisrael, and they then began to say that the people are too strong to be conquered... **R' Yochanan** said in the name of **R' Meir**, if lashon harah is not said with some truth in the beginning, no one would believe it, which is why they began with some of the good.
  - “Vayahas Kalev es ha'am ehl Moshe” – Kalev saw that when Yehoshua tried to disagree with the meraglim the people would not even give him a chance to speak. Kalev therefore began with words that sounded as if he was building further on the words of the meraglim (“Is that all that Ben Amram has done for us?” They thought he was going to disparage Moshe). That got the people's attention, and he then began to praise all the things Moshe had done and how anything he tells us to do *is* possible and will be good!
  - The pasuk says that the other meraglim said we cannot go up and fight the people of the land “ki chazak hu mimenu (than us)”. **R' Chanina bar Pappa** said, the meraglim were actually saying that the people of the land were stronger than Him – Hashem.
  - “Eretz ocheles yoshveha hee” – the meraglim saw a lot of deaths taking place in the land and said that it is a land that kills its inhabitants. **Rava** darshened, Hashem said, “I made that happen so that the people should be busy with their dead and not pay attention to the meraglim, but the meraglim interpreted it as being a bad thing.
  - The meraglim said, “in our eyes we were like grasshoppers compared to them, and so were we in their eyes as well”. **R' Mesharshiya** said, the meraglim lied here, because there is no way they knew how they were seen in the eyes of the people of the land.
    - The Gemara says, it is not necessarily true that they lied. It may be that as the meraglim hid in the trees they overheard the people saying that they saw grasshoppers that looked like people in the trees.
  - The pasuk says that after hearing the meraglim's report, the Yidden began to cry. **Rabbah in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the day they returned from spying was Erev Tisha B'Av. That means the Yidden cried that night of Tisha B'Av. Hashem said “you cried this night for no reason, I will establish this night as a time for crying for generations!”
  - When Yehoshua and Kalev tried to convince the Yidden that the land was wonderful and not to fear the people of the land, the Yidden responded by saying “let us stone them (Yehoshua and Kalev)” and the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

pasuk then says that the Shechina appeared at the Ohel Moed. **R' Chiya bar Abba** said, this teaches that they took stones and threw it toward the Shechina.

- The pasuk says that the meraglim who spoke bad about the land died in a plague. **Reish Lakish** said, they died an unusual death, perfectly befitting their aveirah. **R' Chanina bar Pappa** said that **R' Shila of Kfar Timarta** darshened that their tongues became long until they reached their belly buttons, and worms came from their tongues and entered their stomachs, and visa-versa. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, that they died from the askara disease (the throat swells and the person can no longer breath).
- The pesukim tell us that when all the Yidden made it across the Yarden to the west side of the Yarden, the Kohanim carrying the Aron went out on the east side of the Yarden and the waters then returned to flowing the way they always had, leaving Klal Yisrael on the west side of the Yarden and the Aron and Kohanim carrying the Aron on the east side. The pasuk tells us that the Aron lifted the Kohanim that were carrying it, along with itself, to the other side of the Yarden.
  - It was regarding this concept that Uzza was punished. When the Aron was being carried in a wagon to Yerushalayim, Uzza thought the Aron was at risk of falling off and stuck out his hand to steady the Aron. Hashem said, if the Aron can carry the ones “carrying” it, then for sure it can carry itself, and therefore Uzza should not have touched the Aron.
    - The pasuk says that Hashem got angry at Uzza and made him die. There is a machlokes between **R' Yochanan and R' Elazar** – one says he died for having touched the Aron, and the other says that he died for going to the bathroom in front of the Aron.
    - The pasuk says that Uzza died next to the Aron of Hashem. **R' Yochanan** said, this teaches that Uzza went into Olam Habbah – just as the Aron exists forever (it is hidden and not destroyed) so too Uzza lives on in Olam Habbah.
    - The pasuk says “vayichar l'Dovid” upon the death of Uzza. **R' Elazar** said, this does not refer to anger, for if so the pasuk would have said “vayichar ahf”. Rather it means that his face changed color out of the pain that he felt for the death of Uzza.
    - **Rava** said, Dovid was punished by having the death of Uzza come about through him (Dovid transported the Aron on the wagon) because Dovid referred to Torah as a song. Hashem said, it is written about the Torah “close your eyes from it and it is gone”, and yet you refer to it as a song, so I will have you make a mistake about something that even the schoolchildren know. The pasuk says that the family of Kehas did not get wagons, because they carried the holy keilim and did so on their shoulders. From here we see that the Aron should never be placed on a wagon.
  - The pasuk tells us that when the Aron was returned from the Plishtim it arrived in Beis Shemesh, and people were punished because they “looked” at the Aron. Why would they be punished for looking at the Aron? There is a machlokes between **R' Avahu and R' Elazar** – one says because they continued doing their work and did not stop in honor of the Aron as it arrived, and the other says that they actually spoke disrespectfully about the Aron.
    - The pasuk says that at that time there were killed “70 men, 150,000 men”. There is a machlokes between **R' Avahu and R' Elazar** – one says 70 men were killed, each of them being equal to 150,000 men. The other says that 150,000 men were killed, each of which were equal to the 70 Sanhedrin.
  - Dovid waited months after the death of Uzza before continuing the journey of the Aron to Yerushalayim. When he continued the journey, one pasuk says that for every six steps they took Dovid brought an ox and another animal as a korbon. Another pasuk says that he brought seven parim and seven eilim!? **R' Pappa bar Shmuel** explained, that for every single step he brought an ox and another animal, and for every 6 steps he brought the 7 parim and eilim. **R' Chisda** says that number would be too high. Rather, for every six steps he brought the ox and the other animal, and for every six sets of six steps he brought the 7 parim and 7 eilim.
  - One pasuk says the story with Uzza happened in Kidon and another pasuk says it happened in Nachon? **R' Yochanan** said, these names refer to the Aron. After the death of Uzza it was called Kidon (meaning a



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

spear) for having caused the death of Uzza. After being in the house of Oved Edom and bringing bracha to his house, it was called Nachon (established).

- It turns out that there were 3 sets of stones that were used. One that was used by Moshe, which we learn though a gezeirah shava also had the entire Torah written on them, and was placed in Moav. The second set that was placed in the Yarden as a remembrance (as stated earlier) and the third set on which was written the Torah in 70 languages and was placed in Gilgal.
- The Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says that the Torah was first written on the stones (in 70 languages after crossing the Yarden) and was then covered in plaster. **R' Shimon** said, this can't be, because how were the goyim supposed to learn the Torah from these stones if the writing was covered by plaster!? **R' Yehuda** said, Hashem gave the goyim the intelligence to have their scribes peel back the plaster, and copy the words of the Torah, and because the goyim had the chance to learn and didn't, their fate to Gehenom was then sealed. **R' Shimon** says that the words of the Torah were written on top of the plaster, and a pasuk was written below which let them know that if they did teshuva, the teshuva would be accepted.
  - There is a Braisa that says that the parsha of "yefas to'ar" even applies to the Kinaanim of Chutz Laaretz who have done teshuva, whose teshuva would be accepted. This follows the view of **R' Shimon** in the Braisa above.

### -----Daf ל"ג---36-----

- The Braisa continues and says, look how many nissim occurred for the Yidden on that day (that they entered Eretz Yisrael): they crossed over the Yarden (with all the miracles previously discussed), they traveled to Har Grizim and Har Eival which were more than 60 mil away (which could not have been traveled in that amount of time without a miracle), no creature could stand up against them (out of fear), and any creature that did stand up against them immediately became incontinent. We see in pesukim that a fear was placed on all to prevent them from standing up against the Yidden.
  - The pasuk in the shira says "ahd yaavor amcha Hashem" – this refers to the first conquering of Eretz Yisrael, "ahd yaavor ahm zu kanisa" – this refers to the second conquering of Eretz Yisrael. From here we see that the Yidden were supposed to have the same level of nissim the second time as by the first time, but the aveiros caused this not to happen.
- The Braisa continues, the Yidden then brought the stones from the Yarden and built a Mizbe'ach by Har Eival and covered it with plaster. They then wrote on them the Torah in 70 languages and brought Korbon Olos and Shelamim. They ate, drank, and rejoiced, and then did the brachos and klalos. They then took apart the Mizbe'ach and erected the stones in Gilgal, where they spent the night.
- A Braisa says, the tzirah (a poisonous insect) did not cross the Yarden with the Yidden.
  - **Q:** A pasuk says that the tzirah was sent to drive out the goyim!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, the tzirah stood on the eastern side of the Yarden and threw their poison across the Yarden at the goyim, making the goyim become blind and sterile. **R' Pappa** said, there were 2 tziras. One was around in the times of Moshe, and that one did not cross the Yarden. There was another that was with Yehoshua, and that one did cross the Yarden with them.

### SHISHA SHEVATIM ALU L'ROSH HAR GRIZIM...

- **Q:** When referring to the other six shevatim that went up on Har Eival the pasuk says "v'hachetzyo" ("and the half", as if referring to the known half). What is meant by that? **A: R' Kahana** said, this teaches that the way they were divided between the mountains was the same way the names of the shevatim were divided when they were written on the two stones of the Eiphod.
  - **Q:** A Braisa brings a machlokes as to the order in which the names were written on the stones of the Eiphod. According to all views in the Braisa the division was *not* the same as the way the shevatim were divided between Har Grizim and Har Eival!? **A:** This is a **TEYUFTA** of **R' Kahana**.
  - **Q:** If so, we return to our original question of what is meant by the word "v'hachetzyo"! **A:** The word teaches us that the number of people on Har Grizim outnumbered the number of people on Har Eival. This was true even though the Levi'im, who were counted among the shevatim to be on Har Grizim,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

actually stood in the valley in between. The reason there were more people on Har Grizim was because Shevet Yosef was on Har Grizim, and they were a very populous shevet. We find that they were so as we are taught that Shevet Yosef told Yehoshua that they need a larger portion in Eretz Yisrael because they are so populous. Yehoshua responded to them, that if that is so they should go and hide in the forest, meaning they should take care not to get any ayin harah. Shevet Yosef responded, ayin harah has no effect on Yosef (or his descendants), as the pasuk says about Yosef “alei ayin”, which **R’ Avahu** explains should be read as “olei ayin” – they rise above the eye (the eye of ayin harah). **R’ Yose the son of R’ Chanina** said, we learn this concept from the fact that the pasuk compares Yosef to fish (“v’yidgu larov”). This teaches that just as fish are not subject to ayin harah because they are always covered by the water, so too the descendants of Yosef are not subject to ayin harah.

- **Q:** The Braisa that discussed the names of the Shevatim on the stones of the Eiphod said that there were 25 letters on each side. However, there is only a total of 49 letters in the combined names of the Shevatim!? **A: R’ Yitzchak** said, the name of Yosef was written with a “hey”, as the pasuk says “eidus BiHoseif”.
  - **Q: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, the pasuk says the name were written “k’soldosam” (as given to them at birth), which means that Yosef was not written with a “hey”!? **A:** The name of Binyamin was written with 2 “yuds”, which is the way it was given at birth.
  - **R’ Chana bar Bizna in the name of R’ Shimon Chasida** said, Yosef was mekadesh Shem Shamayim in private and therefore had one letter of Hashem’s Name added to his name. Yehuda was mekadesh Shem Shamayim publicly, and therefore had the entire Name of Hashem become part of his name (Yehuda has the letters of Hashem’s Name).
    - The story with Yosef is how he overcame his yetzer harah to be with the wife of Potifar. The pesukim are darshened to teach that on the day of a national holiday, when all the people of the household went to their house of worship, the wife of Potifar feigned illness and stayed home, because she knew that Yosef would be the only one home and thought it would be a great opportunity to be mezaneh with him. The pasuk is then darshened to teach us that Yosef also planned to go and be mezaneh with her on that day. As he was going to be mezaneh, in the window there appeared the image of his father who said to him – Yosef, in the future the names of all your brothers will be inscribed into the stones of the Eiphod. Do you want to be included along with them or do you want to be known as the friend of the zonos? Immediately Yosef was able to control his yetzer harah. He dug his fingers into the ground and miraculously the zerah came out from under his fingernails.
      - A Braisa says, Yosef was worthy to have 12 shevatim born to him just as his father Yaakov had. However, when the zerah came from his 10 fingers he lost 10 Shevatim and remained with 2. Even so, his brother Binyamin had the other 10, and named all those 10 with names that alluded to Yosef and the tzaros that he had to deal with (the Braisa details each of the names of the 10 sons, and how they were each a reference to Yosef and his troubles).
    - **R’ Chiya bar Abba in the name of R’ Yochanan** said, when Pharaoh appointed Yosef as second to the king, his astrologers said to him that a servant may not become king in Egypt, so Yosef may not be appointed to this position. Pharaoh told them, I see that he has qualities of royalty, and he therefore must have been unrightfully sold and is not a true slave. They said, still, in order to ascend to this position he must be fluent in all 70 languages! Pharaoh agreed to test Yosef. In the interim, Malach Gavriel came and taught all 70 languages to Yosef, but Yosef could not grasp them. Gavriel added the letter “hey” (from the Name of Hashem) to the name of Yosef and he was then able to grasp the languages. When Pharaoh began to test him on all 70 languages and saw that Yosef knew them all, Yosef began to speak to Pharaoh in Lashon Hakodesh. Pharaoh did not understand the language and although Yosef tried to teach it to him, he could not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

grasp it. Pharaoh asked Yosef to swear to him that he would not tell anybody that there was a language that he did not know, and Yosef swore to that. We see this later, after Yaakov died, when Yosef asked Pharaoh for permission to go and bury Yaakov in Eretz Yisrael “as I swore to him”. He said that because Pharaoh did not want to allow him to go and told Yosef to simply be matir neder. Yosef told him, if I am matir neder, maybe I should also be matir neder for the oath that you made me take a few years back. With that threat in mind, Pharaoh reluctantly allowed Yosef to go.

### -----Daf י"ג-----37-----

- The Gemara earlier mentioned that Yehuda was publicly mekadash Sheim Shamayim. This is taught to us in a Braisa, which says that **R' Meir** said, when the Yidden got to the Yam Suf the Shevatim began to argue as to who should have the zechus to jump into the water first. Binyamin went ahead and jumped in before the rest (as can be darshened from pesukim). The people of Yehuda were upset that they ran in first and began to throw stones at the people of Binyamin. For being first, Binyamin merited having the Kodesh Hakodashim in his portion of Eretz Yisrael. **R' Yehuda** says that is not the way the story went. Rather, the Shevatim were arguing as to who should go in first because *no one* wanted to be first. Nachshon ben Aminadav (who was from Yehuda) went and jumped in first (this is where Yehuda was mekadash Sheim Shamayim publicly). As this was going on, Moshe stood and davened to Hashem. Hashem said to Moshe – My beloved Yidden are drowning in the Yam and you just stand there and daven!?! Moshe asked, what can I do? Hashem told him, tell the Yidden to travel into the Yam Suf and lift your staff and stretch out your hand... It was in this zechus (of being first) that Yehuda merited to be the kings of Klal Yisrael.
- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** said, in one place the Torah writes that the Levi'im stood up on Har Grizim, and in another place it writes that they stood in the valley below. Which one was it? He answers that the Elders of the Kohanim and Levi'im stood in the valley below, and the remaining stood up on the mountain. **R' Yoshiya** says the Levi'im who were fit to do their Avodah (between the age of 30-50) were below in the valley. The rest were up on the mountain. **Rebbi** says all of Klal Yisrael stood below in the valley. They all turned towards Har Grizim when the brachos were said, and towards Har Eival when the klalos were said. Although the pasuk says that they stood “ahl” (on) the mountain, the word “ahl” in this context means “near” the mountain. We find a Braisa that teaches that the word “ahl” can be understood as meaning “near”.

#### HAFCHU PNEIHEM KLAPEI HAR GRIZIM UPASCHU B'BRACHA...

- A Braisa says, there was a general bracha stated (for one who keeps the Torah) and then specific brachos (corresponding to each of the klalos mentioned in the pesukim). Similarly, there was a general klala stated (for one who doesn't keep the Torah) and then the specific klalos mentioned in the pesukim. Every mitzvah has four parts – to learn it, to teach it, to guard it, and to do it – and a separate bracha and a separate klala was given for each part of each mitzvah, both in the general and in the specific. That means that were 16 “brisim” given for each mitzvah (a general bracha, a specific bracha, a general klala, and a specific klala, for each of the four parts, for a total of 16 brisim). This was done also at Sinai, and again in Arvos Moav. This means that there was a total of 48 brisim (16 times the three places) for each mitzvah. **R' Shimon** removes Har Grizim and Har Eival as being one of these 3 places (because only a few of the mitzvos were mentioned there, not all the mitzvos) and puts the Ohel Moed in its place.
  - **R' Shimon and the T”K** can be said to be arguing in the machlokes of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says the general principles of the mitzvos were given at Sinai, and the particulars were given at the Ohel Moed. **R' Akiva** says that the general principles and the particulars were given at Sinai, then repeated at the Ohel Moed and repeated again in Arvos Moav. We can say that the **T”K** holds like **R' Yishmael**, who says that the teaching at the Ohel Moed was a continuation of Sinai, and not counted on its own. **R' Shimon** would agree with **R' Akiva**.
- The Braisa continues, from here we see that there is not a mitzvah in the Torah that does not have 48 brisim associated with it. **R' Shimon ben Yehuda of Kfar Akko in the name of R' Shimon** said, every mitzvah was given with brisim equal to the 48 times 603,550 (equal to the number of men at Har Sinai), because each Yid is

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

responsible for the keeping of the mitzvos of every other Yid. **Rebbi** says, this number must again be multiplied by 603,550. **R' Mesharshiya** explains, **Rebbi** holds that every Yid is responsible as a guarantor for the keeping of the mitzvos of every other Yid, *and* every Yid is also a guarantor on every other Yid's guarantor obligation as well (thus necessitating the additional multiplying). **R' Shimon ben Yehuda** says one is not responsible for another Yid's guarantor obligation, and therefore one level of multiplication is sufficient.

- **R' Yehuda bar Nachmeini, the meturgaman of Reish Lakish** darshened, all the klalos were only said regarding people involved in adultery. It must be this way, because the curse that says "Cursed is the one who makes an avodah zarah" – can't be referring to that literally, for such a person would not suffice with a simple curse, but would rather be punished much more severely in this world and the next. Therefore, it must be referring to a man who was mezaneh and produced a mamzer, who then went and assimilated and worshipped avodah zarah. It is the parents of this child who are cursed for bringing this about and causing him to do so.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the brachos should be given on Har Grizim and the klalos on Har Eival. This can't be understood in its simple form, because we are already told that Har Grizim was for the brachos and Har Eival for the klalos. Rather, it is teaching that the brachos are said before the klalos. However, the pasuk's use of the singular ("bracha" and "klalah") teaches that one bracha is said and followed by the corresponding klala, and so on, rather than saying all the brachos followed by all the klalos. It also comes to teach a hekesh between the brachos and klalos: just as the klalos are to be said by the Levi'im, the same is true for the brachos; just as the klalos are to be said in a loud voice, the same is true for the brachos; just as the klalos are to be said in Lashon Hakodesh, the same is true for the brachos; just as the klalos were said in the general form and the specific form, the same is true for the brachos; and just as in response to the klalos all the Yidden were to answer "Amen", the same is true for the brachos.