



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

Kiddushin Daf Lamed Tes

- With regard to orlah in chutz laaretz, **Levi** said to **Shmuel**, “create a safek for me with orlah fruits in chutz laaretz and I will eat it” (he held that one may even put himself into a situation of safek orlah and eat it). **R' Avya and Rabbah bar R' Chanan** would create situations of safek for each other and eat the safek orlah. The sharp ones of Pumbedisa said that there is no concept of orlah in chutz laaretz. When **R' Yehuda** asked **R' Yochanan** about orlah in chutz laaretz, **R' Yochanan** sent back “Hide the halacha of safek orlah (do not announce to anyone that it is mutar), and destroy the definite orlah, and announce that the fruit of the people who are not careful with orlah in chutz laaretz must be put away until we know that it is definitely not orlah, and whoever says that orlah does not apply in chutz laaretz shall not have a child or grandchild included in the Congregation of Hashem!”
 - The sharp ones of Pumbedisa held like **R' Eliezer HaGadol**, from whom it was repeated in his name that orlah does not apply in chutz laaretz.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that **R' Eliezer** said *even* chadash applies in chutz laaretz, which suggests that orlah certainly applies there!? **A:** Change the Mishna to read without the word “even”.
- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said that orlah applies in chutz laaretz based on a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.
 - **Q:** **R' Zeira** asked **R' Assi**, if that is true, why does the Mishna say that we are lenient with a safek orlah in chutz laaretz? Since it is a D'Oraisa, we should be machmir!? **A:** **R' Assi** was at first quiet and he then said, the Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai itself says that we should be lenient with safek orlah in chutz laaretz.
- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if one is oiver on klayim in chutz laaretz, he will get malkus D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** **R' Elazar** asked **R' Assi**, a Mishna says that klayim in chutz laaretz is only D'Rabanan!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing klayim of the vineyard (“klai hakerem”), which in chutz laaretz is only D'Rabanan. **R' Yochanan** is discussing grafting one tree onto another, which is a type of klayim that is assur D'Oraisa even in chutz laaretz. In fact, we find that **Shmuel** makes this distinction as well.
 - **R' Chanan and R' Anan** were walking and they saw someone planting seeds of different species together in chutz laaretz. One of them said to the other, you should put him in cheirem for violating the issur of klayim in chutz laaretz which is a D'Rabanan! The other replied, you are unclear with the halachos of klayim, because such klayim in chutz laaretz is not assur.
 - They then saw a man planting wheat and barley in the grapevines. Again one said, you should put this person in cheirem! The other replied, we pasken like **R' Yoshiya**, who holds that the D'Oraisa issur of klayim is when a person plants wheat, barley, and grape seeds all together. Therefore, only a case like this will be assur D'Rabanan in chutz laaretz. This man was planting wheat and barley near an existing grapevine and it is therefore not assur even D'Rabanan.
 - **R' Yosef** mixed seeds of different species and planted them. **Abaye** asked him, the Mishna says that klayim is assur D'Rabanan in chutz laaretz!? He answered, the Mishna is discussing klai hakerem, and what I did, did not involve the vineyard and is therefore not even assur D'Rabanan. The reason is, klai hakerem which in EY is assur to benefit from, in chutz laaretz they were goizer and made it assur. Klayim of other seeds, that in EY is not assur to benefit from, they did not make assur D'Rabanan in chutz laaretz. **R' Yosef** later said, I must be incorrect, because **Rav** would plant his gardens with separate areas for each species, presumably so that it not become klayim! **Abaye** said, that is no

proof that klayim is assur, because **Rav** did so just to make the garden look nice, or to make it easier to handle. If he did so for klayim he would have had to space out the different species in a more specific way.

MISHNA

- If one does a single mitzvah, he is rewarded with good in this world, his life is lengthened, and he inherits a portion of Olam Habbah. If one does not do a single mitzvah, he is not rewarded with good in this world, his life is not lengthened, and he does not inherit a portion in Olam Habbah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Our Mishna seems to say that there is reward in this world and the next for any mitzvah. However, another Mishna lists the mitzvos that bring reward in this world and the next as being honoring parents, doing kindness, having guests, bringing peace between people, and learning Torah is equal to them all!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, our Mishna means, if one does one mitzvah more than his aveiros, then he is rewarded in this world and the next and is considered to have fulfilled the entire Torah.
 - **Q:** Does this mean to say that if one does even one mitzvah and it is from the list of the other Mishna that he too will receive reward in this world and the next? **A: R' Shmaya** said, this means that if a person's mitzvos are equal to his aveiros, but one of his mitzvos is from the list of the Mishna, it makes the mitzvos win out over the aveiros and he is rewarded in this world and the next.
 - **Q:** Is it true that if a person has one more mitzvah than he has aveiros he is rewarded in this world and the next? A Braisa says, if a person has more mitzvos than aveiros he is given suffering on this world as if he had no mitzvos (so that he is cleansed of his aveiros and can go to Olam Habbah), whereas someone who has more aveiros than mitzvos is given good on this world as if he had no aveiros (so that he is rewarded for his mitzvos on this world and is then sent to Gehenom)!? **A: Abaye** said, our Mishna means that a person who has more mitzvos is given a "good day" for Olam Habbah, which is accomplished by punishing him on this world. Conversely, one who has more aveiros than mitzvos is given a "bad day" for Olam Habbah, in that he is rewarded in this world and then sent to Gehenom. **A2: Rava** said, the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yaakov** who says that reward for any mitzvah is only given in Olam Habbah. **R' Yaakov** says this must be the case, because how can it be that a person was asked by his father to go and do shiluach hakan (kibud av and shiluach hakan each have a pasuk that says that the reward for this mitzvah is long life and a reward of good) and on his way down the ladder he falls down and dies? It must be that the long life and the good refer to reward in Olam Habbah.
 - **Q:** Maybe such a case can never happen? **A: R' Yaakov** saw this case actually happen.
 - **Q:** Maybe the person was thinking about doing an aveirah and that is why he was punished? **A:** A thought of an aveirah is not treated as having done an aveirah.
 - **Q:** Maybe he had a thought to do avodah zarah, which the pasuk teaches is treated as having done the aveirah? **A: R' Yaakov** was bothered by how the mitzvah itself wouldn't protect a person from having such a thought.
 - **Q: R' Elazar** says that people sent to do a mitzvah are not harmed, so how was this person harmed? **A:** This person was already returning from doing the mitzvah.
 - **Q: R' Elazar** said that such a person is protected even on his return from doing the mitzvah!? **A:** He used a rickety ladder, where danger is ever present, and in such a case a miracle is needed to save him and we cannot rely on a miracle.
 - **R' Yosef** said, if Acheir would have darshened the pesukim as referring to reward in the Next World, like his grandson **R' Yaakov** did, he would not have sinned. Acheir went out to sin either after having seen such a story (the person doing kibud av and shiluach hakan was killed), or after having seen the terrible

death and disgrace to the body of Chutzpis the Meturgeman. When he saw this, he went out and sinned.

- **Q: R' Tuvi bar R' Kisna** asked **Rava**, our Mishna says that one is rewarded with good for *doing* a mitzvah. A Braisa says that if one sits and is not oiver an aveirah he gets reward as if he did a mitzvah. This suggests that he need not *do* anything!? **A: Rava** answered, the Braisa is discussing where a person had the desire and opportunity to do an aveirah and he overcomes the desire and doesn't do it. As we find with **R' Chanina bar Papi**, who was propositioned for znus with a certain woman. At first he used a Name of Hashem to make himself covered in a skin condition. She then said something that healed him. He then ran into a bathhouse that was full of very strong sheidim. He was not harmed because of the Malachim that protected him.
 - The Braisa also makes reference to the story of **R' Tzadok** who was also propositioned for znus and he told the woman, I am not well enough for znus. She offered him non-kosher food. He said, I am being sent a message that one who does znus deserves to eat non-kosher. The woman heated the oven to put in the food, and **R' Tzadok** went into the oven. He told her, whoever does this znus will end up in the fire of Gehenom. She said, had I known that you feel this strongly against it, I would not have asked you.
 - **R' Kahana** was selling baskets to women and he was propositioned for znus. He ran up to the roof and jumped off. Eliyahu came and caught him and told him, you have bothered us to travel 400 parsos to come and save you! He said to Eliyahu, it is my poverty that caused me to have to sell baskets and put me in this situation in the first place! Eliyahu gave him a keili full of dinars.