

30 Mar-Cheshvan 5783
Nov. 24, 2022



Nedarim Daf 30

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Avin and Rav Yitzchak the son of Rebbe were sitting in front of Rabbi Yirmiyah and Rabbi Yirmiyah was dozing. They said as follows: According to bar Padda, who said that the saplings are automatically sanctified again even after they were redeemed, it is possible to resolve Rav Hoshaya’s inquiry. For Rav Hoshaya inquired: If a man gives a woman two *perutos* (a *perutah* is coin of minimal value used to effect a *kiddushin*) and says to her, “You should become married to me with one of these coins and with the other coin, you should become married to me after I divorce you,” what is the *halachah*? According to Bar Padda, the second marriage should take effect. (The comparison is as follows: The woman is eligible to become married to him at the time that she accepted the *perutah* from the man just as the saplings were able to become consecrated at the time of consecration. The woman, on the other hand, was not eligible to become married to him from the moment the marriage was created until after the divorce, since she was married at that time. The saplings are also not eligible to become consecrated from the time of the vow until they were redeemed, since they were already consecrated. Yet, the *Mishnah* rules, according to Bar Padda that the second consecration automatically takes effect. So too, the woman should automatically become married to the man after the divorce.)

Rabbi Yirmiyah woke up and he said to them: Why are you comparing a case where he redeemed the saplings to one where others redeemed them? Rabbi Yochanan said: If he himself redeems them, they automatically become consecrated again; if other people redeem them, they do

not become consecrated again (*since they are now in the possession of someone other than the vower*). Regarding the woman (*after her divorce*), she should be compared to the case where others redeemed the saplings (*since she then enters her own domain, and therefore, the marriage should not take effect*).

It was also stated: Rabbi Ammi said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This was taught only where he redeems them, but where others redeem them, they do not become consecrated again. (29b3 – 30a2)

The *Mishnah* states: If a person vows from “seafarers,” he is permitted to benefit from land dwellers; “from land dwellers,” he is forbidden to benefit from seafarers, for seafarers are included in land dwellers (*since they eventually come back to the land*). And not as those who travel from Akko to Jaffa (*which is merely a short distance*), but one who normally sails (*long distances*). (30a2)

The *Mishnah* had stated: And not as those who travel from Akko to Jaffa (*which is merely a short distance*), but one who normally sails (*long distances*).

Rav Papa and Rav Acha the son of Rav Ikka disagree as to whether this last note of the *Mishnah* is discussing the first section of the *Mishnah* or the last section.

The *Gemora* explains: The one who learns this on the first section understands it as follows: If a person vows from

“seafarers,” he is permitted to benefit from land dwellers. It is evident from here that he is forbidden to benefit from seafarers. The *Mishnah* concludes that we are not discussing those who travel from Akko to Jaffa, for those are regarded as land dwellers; rather, he is forbidden to derive benefit from those who normally sail (*long distances*).

The one who learns this on the last section understands it as follows: If a person vows from “land dwellers,” he is forbidden to benefit from seafarers. The *Mishnah* concludes that not only are we discussing those who travel from Akko to Jaffa; rather, he is even forbidden to derive benefit from those who normally sail (*long distances*), since they will eventually come back to the land. (30a2 – 30b1)

The *Mishnah* states: If a person vows from “those who see the sun,” he is forbidden to benefit even from the blind, since he meant all those whom the sun sees. (30b1)

The *Gemora* asks: Why do we interpret his vow in this manner?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because he didn’t say, “from those who see.” It is evident that he means “all those whom the sun sees.” This would exclude only fish in the sea and fetuses in their mothers’ wombs, which are not seen by the sun (*and from whom he would be permitted to derive benefit*). (30b1)

The *Mishnah* states: If a person vows from “the dark-headed,” he is forbidden to benefit from the bald and the white-haired (*old people*), and he is permitted to benefit from women and minors, for only adult men are called dark-headed. (30b1)

The *Gemora* asks: Why do we interpret his vow in this manner (*including bald and white-haired people*)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because he didn’t say, “from those with hair.” (30b1)

The *Mishnah* had stated: He is permitted to benefit from women and minors, for only adult men are called dark-headed.

The *Gemora* explains: Regarding adult men, they uncover their heads at times and cover their heads at other times (*and since most of them have dark hair, they are referred to as dark-headed*). Women, however, always covered their heads (*as required by halachah*), and it was normal for minors to always walk with uncovered heads. (30b1)

The *Mishnah* states: If a person vows from “the *yilodim*” (*those that were already born*), he is permitted to derive benefit from the *noladim* (*those that will be born*); from “the *noladim*,” he is forbidden to derive benefit even from the *yilodim*. Rabbi Meir permits him to derive benefit even from the *yilodim*. And the *Chachamim* say, he only meant one whose nature it is to be born (*and that is why he is forbidden to benefit even from those already born; he is merely excluding fish and birds, which hatch from eggs, and are not born alive from their mothers*). (30b2)

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Meir, concerning whom did he vow (*if he is permitted to benefit from those already born and certainly those who will be born*)?

The *Gemora* answers: There are some words missing in the *Mishnah*, and this is what it should say: If a person vows from “the *yilodim*,” he is permitted to derive benefit from those that will be born; from “the *noladim*,” he is forbidden to derive benefit even from those already born. Rabbi Meir says: Even one who makes a vow prohibiting benefit from “the *noladim*,” is permitted to derive benefit from those already born, just like one who made a *neder* prohibiting benefit from “the *yilodim*,” is permitted to derive benefit from those that will be born.

Rav Pappa asked Abaye [from certain Scriptural verses where it is evident that the word “*noladim*” means those who were born and that it means those who were already born! What, then, is Rabbi Meir’s reasoning?]: Are we to conclude that *noladim* implies those about to be born? If so,

does the verse: your two sons, which “*hanoladim*” to you in the land of Egypt, — mean ‘who are to be born’? — What then will you say: that it implies who were born? If so, what of the verse: behold a son “*nolad*” to the house of David - Yoshiyahu by name: will you say that he was [already born]? But even Menasheh [Yoshiyahu 's grandfather] was not yet born!

The *Gemora* answers: While it is true that the word “*noladim*” in Scripture may mean those who were born and at times, it means those who were already born; concerning vows, however, we follow the way in which people speak. (30b2)

The Mishnah had stated: And the *Chachamim* say, he only meant one whose nature it is to be born.

Excluding what? — It excludes fish and fowl. (30b3)

Quick Summary

* What inquiry did Rabbi Avin and Rav Yitzchak the son of Rebbe think that they could resolve according to Bar Padda?

If a man gives a woman two *perutos* and says to her, “You should become married to me with one of these coins and with the other coin, you should become married to me after I divorce you.”

* What did they think that the *halachah* should be?

The *kiddushin* should take effect.

* What did Rabbi Yirmiyah answer them?

It should be compared to a case where others redeemed the saplings. Just as there, it does not become sanctified, so too here, the *kiddushin* should not take effect.

* If one makes a *neder* prohibiting benefit from land dwellers, who is forbidden?

Even seafarers.

* Why?

Because they eventually come to land and disembark.

* If one makes a *neder* prohibiting benefit from land dwellers, will those who sail from Akko to Jaffa be included?

This is an Amoraic dispute.

* Who is excluded when one vows from “those who see the sun”?

The fish in the sea and fetuses in their mothers’ wombs.

* If one vows from “black-haired” people, who is he forbidden to benefit from and from whom is he permitted?

He is forbidden from men, but permitted from women and children.

[We use the *sefer Dov’vos Yaakov* extensively to assist us in preparing these summaries.]



INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Two Perutos

What would be the *halachah* if one purchased a field with one *perutah* and stipulated that he is buying it back after he gives it back to the seller?

The Rashba proves from out *Gemora* that it will be ineffective because the *Gemora* needs to say a case where there were two *perutos*.

The Chasam Sofer makes a distinction: Our *Gemora* needs to discuss a case with two *perutos*, for *kiddushin* cannot take effect without a *perutah*. However, regarding a field, there are other ways to acquire a field, and it would not be necessary to have two *perutos*.

DAILY MASHAL

Treitel and the Feathers

“Morai v’Rabosai!” The darshan, who told this story, raised his voice. “The lesson of this wonderful parable is...” Suddenly a person rose and addressed the darshan: “With your permission, the story about Treitel touched me so much that I myself am interested in telling the lesson.” Encouraged by the audience, he approached the dais and began his speech:

“A few months ago I was invited to participate in a Daf HaYomi shi’ur. What can I say? At the end of the first shi’ur I felt like Treitel. That day they learnt complex subjects. I didn’t understand the first line so well and wasn’t clear on where the question ended and where the answer started. Deep inside I felt that I didn’t understand what the question was all about. I came home worn out and disappointed. It’s not for me, I decided. The phone rang and I heard the voice of the magid shi’ur, who had gauged my feelings. It’s in his merit that I continued to

attend the shi’ur. My friends, if only we would understand that all the silver and gold in the world are not enough to acquire the tremendous pleasure that a learner feels after a continuous period of studying the holy Torah. We could then survive the difficulties faced at the outset.

“It could be that at first a learner feels like Treitel. Two feathers. It jabs you. But every day a learner adds another feather, another shi’ur. He understands more. He gets a background, understanding and concepts. After a short while he gets a pillow full of feathers, a whole tractate with all its chapters, dapim and lines. We should not calculate the enjoyment of learning a whole tractate of 50 dapim just by multiplying the pleasure caused by a single page 50 times over. A wise man once said that a lot of units form a whole but the whole itself is a new entity. Granted, there are fragments that must be reviewed to be understood but the wonderful whole achieved by toil cannot be compared.