



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

Kiddushin Daf Lamed Ches

- **Q:** According to the view that use of the word “dwelling” in a pasuk teaches that the mitzvah applies in EY and chutz laaretz (and does not teach that the mitzvah did not go into effect until after the conquer and division of EY), we can understand the pasuk that says that when Bnei Yisrael entered EY they did not eat from the chadash (the new crop) until the second day of Pesach, because it was then that they brought the Korbon Omer and became permitted to eat the chadash. However, according to the view that “dwelling” teaches that the mitzvah does not take effect until after the conquer and division of the land, why did they have to wait until the second day of Pesach to eat the chadash? Why couldn't they eat it immediately upon entry into EY!? **A:** In truth they could have (they were permitted to). The reason they did not eat from the chadash until that date was because they still had maan to carry them over until that date. We learn from an explanation to a seeming contradiction in the pesukim that the maan stopped falling when Moshe Rabeinu passed away, on the 7th of Adar, and they had enough maan to continue feeding them until the second day of Pesach.
 - A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the Yidden ate maan for 40 years. However, when calculating the dates from when the maan first came down until the maan no longer existed, it is actually 40 years less 30 days. From here we see that the “ugos” (cakes) that they brought with them from Mitzrayim (and lived on for the 30 days until the maan began to fall) had the taste of maan. Based on this the pasuk means that the Yidden had the taste of maan for 40 years.
 - A Braisa says that Moshe Rabbeinu passed away on the 7th of Adar and he was also born on the 7th of Adar. We can calculate his date of passing from the pesukim. The pasuk says that he passed away. The pasuk then says that the Yidden mourned him for 30 days. The pasuk then says that Hashem told the Yidden that in 3 days' time they will cross the Yarden. The pasuk then says that they crossed the Yarden on the 10th of Nisson. If we go back 33 days from the 10th of Nisson, we can figure out that Moshe passed away on the 7th of Adar. We can now figure out that Moshe was born on the 7th of Adar as well, because when he spoke on his final day, he said “I am 120 years old today”. The word “today” teaches that Hashem completes the years of tzaddikim, and Moshe was therefore niftar on his birthday.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Yochai** says, there are 3 mitzvos that were commanded to the Yidden when they entered EY, and they apply in EY and in chutz laaretz – chadash, orlah, and klayim. In fact, we can learn though a kal v'chomer that they should apply in chutz laaretz as well. If chadash, which is not assur forever, and is not assur in benefit, and its issur can be removed (with the bringing of the Omer), applies in EY and in chutz laaretz, then klayim, whose issur is forever, and is assur in benefit, and its issur cannot be removed, should surely apply in chutz laaretz as well! We can make this same kal v'chomer for orlah, except that we can only use 2 of these points (because the orlah issur is not forever, since the fruit after the 3rd year is mutar). **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, any mitzvah which was commanded to the Yidden before they entered EY, applies in EY and in chutz laaretz. Any mitzvah in which they were commanded after entering EY, only applies in EY, except for cancellation of debts upon shmitta, and the letting free of slaves upon Yovel, which were commanded after having entered EY, but still apply in chutz laaretz as well.
 - **Q:** The requirement of cancellation of debts for shmitta is a personal obligation, and as such should clearly apply in chutz laaretz as well, so how can it be thought to have been different? **A:** The reason this was taught was because of a Braisa that says that **Rebbi** says, that the pasuk refers to “2 shmittos” (on land and of debts) and teaches that at a time when shmitta applies to the land (after the land was settled) it applies to debts as

well. When it does not apply to the land, it does not apply to debts. We see that the halacha of shmitta did not apply before they entered EY. Therefore, **R' Elazar** had to say, that even so, it still applies in chutz laaretz.

- **Q:** Based on the Braisa, why don't we say that cancellation of debts only applies where shmitta of the land applies – i.e. in EY!? **A:** The pasuk says “ki karah shmitta La'Shem”, which teaches that it applies even in chutz laaretz.
- **Q:** The requirement to free slaves at Yovel is a personal obligation, and as such should clearly apply in chutz laaretz as well, so how can it be thought to have been different? **A:** The pasuk says “ukrasem dror baaretz”. We would learn that this only applies in EY (based on the word baaretz). The pasuk therefore says “Yovel hee” to teach that it applies even in chutz laaretz.
 - **Q:** If so, why does the pasuk even say the word “baaretz”? **A:** This teaches that only when Yovel applies in EY is there an obligation to free the slaves in chutz laaretz.
- A Mishna says, chadash is assur D'Oraisa in every place (EY and chutz laaretz). Orlah is assur in every place based on “halacha”. Klayim is assur in every place D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** What is meant by “halacha”? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, this means it is based on the minhag accepted by the Yidden of chutz laaretz, and **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** said, it means a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.
 - **Q:** **Ulla** asked **R' Yehuda**, a Mishna says that we treat a safek orlah in chutz laaretz differently and more stringently than we treat safek klayim in chutz laaretz. Now, according to **Ulla** this makes sense, because Orlah in chutz laaretz is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai (which is a D'Oraisa), and klayim in chutz laaretz is only D'Rabanan. However, according to **R' Yehuda**, since they are both D'Rabanan, they should be treated the same!? **A:** We find that **Shmuel** told **R' Anan**, change the Mishna so that it reads that they are treated the same, either that they are both treated stringently, or are both treated leniently.
 - **Mar the son of Rabana** said that they are both treated leniently.