



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

Sanhedrin Daf Chuf Aleph

MISHNA

- The pasuk says "lo yarbeh lo nashim", which teaches that a king may only take up to 18 wives. **R' Yehuda** says that a king may take more than 18 wives as long as they don't turn his heart away from Hashem. **R' Shimon** says, even if there is only one wife who will turn his heart from Hashem, he may not marry her, and when the pasuk says "lo yarbeh lo nashim" it is even referring to wives like Avigayil (righteous wives, who must be limited to 18 wives).

GEMARA

- **Q:** The pasuk says that the reason a king may not have many wives is "v'lo yasur livavo" (so that he not turn his heart from Hashem). Based on this, it seems that **R' Yehuda**, who allows for more wives when they do not turn his heart from Hashem, holds this way because he darshens the reason for the pasuk (takes into account the reason, and when that reason does not apply he says that the issur in the pasuk does not apply), and **R' Shimon** who says it is limited to 18 does not darshen the reason behind the pasuk. However, in a Braisa regarding the taking of collateral from a widow we clearly see that it is **R' Shimon** who darshens the reason behind a pasuk and **R' Yehuda** who does not!? **A:** In general, **R' Yehuda** does not darshen the reason behind a pasuk. However, with regard to the king's wives the pasuk explicitly gives the reason by saying "v'lo yasur livavo". Therefore, in this pasuk he does darshen the reason. **R' Shimon** always darshens the reason behind the pasuk. Therefore, there was no reason for the pasuk here to explicitly write the reason. The fact that it did so is teaching that even if the wives are all righteous, he is limited to 18 wives.
- **Q:** Where do we find that the number of wives is limited to 18? **A:** The pasuk tells of Nosson Hanavi's talk with Dovid Hamelech (after his taking of Batsheva). He tells of Dovid living in Chevron, and lists the children that he had from his 6 wives while there. He then says that Hashem says, "if these were too little, I would add for you 'as much and as much'". This means, Hashem was saying that Dovid could have added another 6 wives ("as much") and then another 6 wives ("and as much"), which would bring the total to 18.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked, maybe "as much" means he could double what he had (bringing the total to 12), and "and as much" means he could then double that to 24!? In fact, a Braisa says that "lo yarbeh lo nashim" limits his wives to 24. **Q2:** According to the view that darshens when a pasuk writes a "vuv", the "vuv" of "v'kaheina" ("and as much") should double the total yet again, bringing the total number of wives he may have to 48!? In fact, a Braisa says that "lo yarbeh lo nashim" limits his wives to 48. **A: R' Kahana** said that our Tanna in the Mishna holds that we compare the second "as much" to the first "as much". Just like the first one refers to an additional 6 wives, the second one does as well.
 - **Q:** Michal was a wife of Dovid in Chevron and yet she is not listed in the pasuk that lists his wives!? **A: Rav** said, the wife referred to as "Eglah" is in fact Michal, and she was referred to as Eglah (which is a calf), because she was very beloved by Dovid.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says that Eglah had a child, and we are taught that Michal was punished and could not have children, because she felt it was improper for Dovid to dance as he did for the Aron Hakodesh when it was brought to Yerushalayim!? **A: R' Chisda** said, when the pasuk says that she didn't have children "until the day that she died", it means that on the day that she died she did have children.
 - **Q:** Dovid lived in Chevron before moving to Yerushalayim, so she was only punished after the move, which means she was alive after they

moved from Chevron, which means that she had children before the day that she died!? **A:** Rather, before she was punished she had children, but from when she was punished she no longer had any children.

- **Q:** The pasuk says that Dovid took “more wives and pilagshim from Yerushalayim”. It seems that he took more than 18 wives!? **A:** These additional wives brought the total to 18.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** explains, “wives” means they were given kiddushin and a kesubah, “pilagshim” don’t have kiddushin or a kesubah.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, there were 400 young men in Dovid’s army that were the children of women taken as a “yifas to’ar”. They grew their hair like the goyim, sat in golden wagons, and led the troops. They were the strong men of the house of Dovid.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Tamar the daughter of Dovid was the daughter of a “yifas to’ar”. We learn this from the pasuk that says that when Dovid’s son, Amnon, was going to rape her she pleaded with him not to, and said she would seek permission from Dovid to marry him. If her mother was truly married to Dovid, she would never have been allowed to marry him, so she would never have even suggested that they ask Dovid.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Yonadav, who gave a plan to Amnon to lure Tamar into his house and give him the opportunity to rape her, is described in the pasuk as being a wise man – this means he was wise in ways of evil.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Amnon faked illness to his father and asked that Tamar be sent to cook for him. Dovid didn’t think this was odd, because he asked for a fried dish, which is something that must be made in the house it will be eaten and could not have been made in the palace and sent over.
 - The pasuk says that after raping her, Amnon hated Tamar very much. **R’ Yitzchak** explains that she made her pubic hair cause him injury which caused that he could no longer have children (making him a “krus shafcha”).
 - **Q:** A pasuk says that the Jewish girls did not have hair under their arms or in their pubic areas!? **A:** She was the daughter of a yifas to’ar, and therefore did have such hair.
 - The pasuk says that after she was raped, Tamar put ashes on her head and ripped her clothing. **R’ Yehoshua ben Korcha** said, by doing so she taught to all, that if such a thing can happen to her it can happen to anybody, and therefore all women must be careful.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, at that time the **Rabanan** were goizer that one may also not go into seclusion with an unmarried woman either (D’Oraisa the issur of seclusion with a woman only applies to one of the arayos, not to an unmarried woman who is not a relative).
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** explained the pasuk that says that Adoniya said he will be king, to mean that he tried to fit the crown on his head, but it would not fit properly.
 - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk says that Adoniya had 50 men running in front of his chariots. This refers to 50 men who had their spleens removed and the skin and flesh from their soles removed (spleens and skin under the soles are what cause people to have to run slower).

MISHNA

- The pasuk says “lo yarbeh lo susim”, which teaches that a king should only have as many horses as he needs for his chariots. The pasuk then says “v’kesef v’zahav lo yarbeh lo me’od”, which teaches that he should only amass enough personal wealth that is needed to pay for the army.
- The king must write a Sefer Torah for himself. When he goes out to war, he is to take it out with him. When he returns, it comes back with him. When he sits in judgement, it must be with him. When he reclines, it must be opposite him. This is all based on the pasuk that says, “v’huysa imo v’kara bo kol yimei chayav”.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, we would think that the pasuk of “lo yarbeh lo susim” means he may not even keep enough for his chariots. The pasuk therefore says “lo” – he may not keep in excess for himself, but he may keep what is needed for the chariots. The issur applies to idle horses that he wants to own for prestige. The pasuk of “l’maan harbos sus” teaches that even if he has just one horse that sits idle, he is over on the lav. If so, why does the earlier pasuk say “susim” in the plural? It teaches that the king would transgress a separate lav for each and every horse that he has sitting idle.
 - **Q:** If not for the word “lo” we would think that he could not even keep enough horses for what he needs for his chariots? **A:** “Lo” teaches that he is allowed to keep extra horses for the chariots (even more than is immediately needed), but cannot have excess for himself.

V’KESEF V’ZAHAV LO YARBEH LO...

- A Braisa says, we would think that the pasuk of “v’kesef v’zahav lo yarbeh lo” means, that he may not even amass enough money needed to support the army. The pasuk therefore says “lo” – he may not keep in excess for himself, but he may keep what is needed for the army.
 - **Q:** If not for the word “lo” we would think that he could not even keep enough for the army? **A:** “Lo” teaches that he is allowed to keep extra for the army (even more than is immediately needed), but cannot have excess for himself.
 - **Q:** Now that we see to darshen the word “lo”, how would we darshen that word in the pasuk of “lo yarbeh lo nashim”? **A:** This comes to exclude others (people other than the king) from the lav.
- **R’ Yehuda** asked, one pasuk says that Shlomo had 40,000 lines of stalls for the horses for his chariots and another pasuk says it was 4,000? He answered, either he had 40,000 stables of which each had 4,000 lines of stalls, or he had 4,000 stables of which each had 40,000 lines of stalls.
- **R’ Yitzchak** asked, one pasuk says that silver had no value in the days of Shlomo (because there was so much of it), and another pasuk says that silver was like stones (which means it had some limited value)? He answered, the first pasuk is referring to before Shlomo married the daughter of Paroh, and the second pasuk is referring to after he married her.
 - **R’ Yitzchak** said, when Shlomo married the daughter of Paroh, Gavriel came down and stuck a reed into the sea. Land began to form around it and this eventually became Rome (the tormentors of Klal Yisrael).
 - **R’ Yitzchak** said, the reason that the explanations for the mitzvos are not given in the pesukim, is because in 2 places that the explanations were given, it was the cause of the great one of the world (Shlomo Hamelech) to transgress them. He said, the reason he can’t marry many wives is so that his heart not be turned from Hashem, and he reasoned that his heart will not be turned and he can therefore marry many wives. However, the pasuk says that in his old age his wives did turn his heart from Hashem. He also said, that the reason that he can’t have many horses is so that that he not bring the Yidden back to Mitzrayim (as the pasuk states), and he reasoned that he would have many horses and not bring them back to Mitzrayim. However, the pasuk says that most of his horses came from Mitzrayim (showing that it did cause people to go back there).

V’KOSAV SEFER TORAH LISHMO

- A Braisa says, he cannot rely on a Sefer Torah that he inherits from his father. Rather, he must write a new one for himself.
 - **Rava** said, even if a person inherits a Sefer Torah from his father, it is a mitzvah for him to write a new one for himself, as the pasuk says “v’atah kisvu lachem es hashira”.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the Braisa said that a *king* cannot rely on the Torah he inherits. This suggests that a regular person can!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the second Sefer Torah that only a king has an obligation to write (besides the mitzvah that he has to write one like everybody else), as the pasuk says “v’kasav lo es mishnei” (“he must write for himself a second”). It is regarding this additional one that the Braisa is teaching that he must write a new one (and nothing can therefore be inferred regarding the Torah that everybody must write). In fact, we see in a Braisa that he must write a special one that he wears as a bracelet

and stays with him at all times other than when he goes to places in which a Sefer Torah may not be taken.

- **Mar Zutra** or **Mar Ukva** said, originally the Torah was given to us in “ksav Ivri” and in Lashon Hakodesh. It was later given to us in the days of Ezra in “ksav Ashuris” and in Aramaic. The Yidden then chose to use ksav Ashuris and Lashon Hakodesh.
- A Braisa says, that **R’ Yose** said, that if Moshe had not been before Ezra, Ezra was worthy of having the Torah given to Klal Yisrael through him. **R’ Yose** showed this by demonstrating the similarity in a number of psukim written regarding Moshe and regarding Ezra. Even though the Torah wasn’t given through Ezra, the script in which it is written was changed by Ezra to k’sav Ashuris. The pasuk says “es mishnei haTorah hazos”, which teaches that the Torah’s script was destined to change (“mishnei” can be understood to mean “change”). Why is this script called “Ashuris”? It is because it came up with them to EY from Ashur.
 - Another Braisa says, **Rebbi** says the Torah was originally given to K’lal Yisrael in ksav Ashuris, but when they sinned during the times of the First Beis Hamikdash they forgot how to read this script. When they did teshuva it was restored to them. Why is this script called “Ashuris”? It is because it is the nicest of all scripts. **R’ Shimon ben Elazar in the name of R’ Eliezer ben Parta in the name of R’ Elazar Hamoda’i** said, that Ashuris was never changed or forgotten. Rather, the pasuk of “es mishnei haTorah hazos” teaches that a king must have 2 Sifrei Torah written for him – one that goes with him wherever he goes, and one that he keeps with his treasures. The one that stays with him was made as a bracelet to stay with him, as the pasuk says “shivisi Hashem l’negdi samid”.
 - **Q:** How do **R’ Yose and Rebbi** darshen the pasuk of “shivisi...”? **A:** They use it as did **R’ Chana bar Bizna in the name of R’ Shimon Chasida**, to teach that when one davens he should view himself as if he is standing opposite the Shechina.
 - **Q:** The Braisa earlier said that Daniel was the only one able to read the Ashuris written on the wall by the Malach, because that was during the time that all the other Yidden had forgotten how to read that script. According to **R’ Shimon**, who says that it was never forgotten, why could no one other than Daniel read it? **A: Rav** said, the words were not written out. Rather, it was written in code, and Daniel was the only one who was able to understand the code. **Shmuel, R’ Yochanan, and R’ Ashi** also all say that it was written in some type of code, but each of them has a different understanding of what was written and how it was decoded and understood by Daniel.