



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

The Mishna had stated: If a man declared, “I am hereby a *nazir*,” and his wife heard him and said, “Amen,” he may revoke her vow, but his vow remains intact.

The Gemora asks: The following braisa seems to contradict this ruling: If a man says to his wife, “I am hereby a *nazir*; what about you?” If she answers, “Amen,” both become bound (to their vows of *nezirus*), but otherwise (if she did not respond in that manner), both are free (from *nezirus*), because he made his vow contingent on hers? [The first ruling would seem to indicate that he cannot revoke his wife’s vow of *nezirus*; this is unlike the ruling of our Mishna!]

Rav Yehudah replied: Teach the braisa as follows: He can annul her vow, but his own remains binding.

Abaye said: It is even possible to leave the reading intact, for the braisa refers to a case where he said to her, “I am hereby a *nazir* and you,” thus making his vow contingent on her vow; while our Mishna refers to a case where he said to her, “I am hereby a *nazir*; what about you?” And so, he may annul her vow, but his own remains binding. (22b2 – 23a1)

Mishna

If a woman vowed to be a *nazir* and proceeded (intentionally) to drink wine or contract *tumah* from the dead, she receives forty (lashes). If her husband revoked the vow for her, but she did not know that her husband

revoked her vow for her, and she proceeded (intentionally) to drink wine or contract *tumah* from the dead, she does not receive forty (lashes). Rabbi Yehudah says: If she does not receive forty (lashes; according to Torah law), she should at least receive lashes for being rebellious. (23a1)

Requiring Atonement

The Gemora cites a braisa: *Her husband had revoked them, and Hashem will forgive her.* The verse is discussing a woman who had made a vow of *nezirus* and her husband had revoked it without her knowledge. She requires atonement and forgiveness (if she drinks wine and becomes *tamei* to the dead). When Rabbi Akiva used to reach this verse, he would cry. He said: If someone, who intended that pork should come into his hand (he planned on sinning by eating pork) and instead lamb’s meat came into his hand (he ate lamb and did not sin), nevertheless, he requires atonement and forgiveness; then someone who intends that pork should come into his hand (he planned on sinning by eating pork) and indeed pork came into his hand (he actually sins by eating pork), he would certainly (require atonement and forgiveness)! Similarly, the verse states: *And he did not know and he was guilty and carries his sin.* Now, if someone, who intended that lamb’s meat should come into his hand, but instead pork came into his hand; for example: there was a piece of meat before him that was possibly kosher fat and possibly non-kosher fat (and he ate it thinking that it was kosher), the Torah wrote (concerning him): *he must bear his iniquity*; then someone

who intends that pork should come into his hand (he planned on sinning by eating pork) and indeed pork came into his hand (he actually sins by eating pork), he would certainly (require atonement and forgiveness)! Issi ben Yehudah states: *And he did not know and he was guilty and must bear his iniquity.* Now, if someone, who intended that lamb's meat should come into his hand, but instead pork came into his hand; for example: there were two pieces of meat before him - one was non-kosher fat and the other was kosher fat (and he ate one of them thinking that it was the kosher one), the Torah wrote (concerning him): *he must bear his iniquity*; then someone who intends that pork should come into his hand (he planned on sinning by eating pork) and indeed pork came into his hand (he actually sins by eating pork), he would certainly (require atonement and forgiveness)! This should make those who worry (*rightfully about their spiritual life*) concerned.

The *Gemora* asks: Why do we need all of the above cases?

The *Gemora* answers that they are all necessary. For if the braisa would only have taught the case of the woman (who intended to break her vow), I would have thought that there is where she needs atonement and forgiveness, because she intended from the beginning to do something that was forbidden; however, by the case where there was a piece of meat before him that was possibly kosher fat and possibly non-kosher fat (and he ate it thinking that it was kosher), where he intended to do something that was permitted, he would not need atonement and forgiveness. [The Torah teaches us that this is not the case.] And if the braisa would have taught only this case (where there was a piece of meat before him that was possibly kosher fat and possibly non-kosher fat), where there is a prohibition (I might have thought that it is in this case where he needs atonement and forgiveness), however, regarding the woman, where her husband revoked her vow for her, and it is permitted, she should not need atonement and forgiveness. [The Torah teaches us that this is not the case.] And if the braisa

would have taught both of these cases, I would have thought that it is in these two cases where atonement and forgiveness suffices, for there is no definite prohibition before us; however, by the case of the two pieces of meat, where one is forbidden fat and the other is kosher fat, where there is a definite prohibition before us (and he ate one anyway), perhaps atonement and forgiveness will not suffice for him (as he is a deliberate sinner). The Torah therefore teaches us that this is not the case.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: What does the verse mean when it says: *For the roads of Hashem are straight, the righteous will walk in them and the sinners will stumble in them?* It can be explained using a parable of two people who roasted their *Pesach* offerings. One ate it for the sake of the *mitzvah*, and one ate purely for the enjoyment. The one who ate it for the *mitzvah* represents "the righteous will walk in them," and the one who ate it gluttonously represents "and the sinners will stumble in them."

Rish Lakish said to him: You are calling this person evil? It is true that he did not do the *mitzvah* in a choice manner, but he did perform the *mitzvah* of eating the *Pesach* offering?! It is rather comparable to two people who are both alone with their wife and sister (*in a dark room*). One cohabited with his wife, while the other (*mistakenly*) cohabited with his sister. Regarding the first the verse says, "the righteous will walk in them," and regarding the second the verse says, "and the sinners will stumble in them."

The *Gemora* asks: Is this comparable? The verse is discussing a single road with different consequences, and you are discussing two different roads?!

The *Gemora* answers: It is rather comparable to Lot and his two daughters. They had intent to perform a *mitzvah*, and therefore regarding them the verse states, "the righteous will walk in them." Lot had intent for sin, and

therefore concerning him the verse states, “and sinners will walk in them.”

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps his intent was also to perform a *mitzvah*?

Rabbi Yochanan said: The verses imply that his intent was for immorality. The terminology, “and Lot raised,” is the same as, “and the wife of his master raised her eyes.” “His eyes” is similar to the verse: and Shimshon said, “Get her for me, for she is fine in my eyes.” [These verses are discussing sins of promiscuity.] The term, “and he saw,” is the same as “and Shechem the son of Chamar saw her” (relating to immoral looking). “The entire plain of the Jordan,” is similar to “for because of a harlot until a loaf of bread” (both use the term “kikar,” albeit with different simple meanings; he will pay for her services that he will be too poor to have even bread). “For it is well watered everywhere,” is similar to “I will go after those who love me, those who give my bread, water, wool, flax, oil, and wine” (both employ a variation of the term “mashkeh”).

The *Gemora* asks: Wasn’t he in a circumstance beyond his control (because he was drunk)?

The *Gemora* answers: It was taught in the name of Rabbi Yosi bar Rav Chuni: Why is there a dot over the letter “vav” in the word, “and when she got up” regarding the older sister (who was first)? This is to teach us that while he did not know what happened when she was lying down (as he was drunk), he was aware when she got up.

The *Gemora* asks: What should he have done about this (even if he knew after the fact)?

The *Gemora* answers: The next night he should have abstained from wine.

Rava taught: What does the verse mean when it says: a rebelling brother from a city of strength, who creates

contentions like the bolt of a castle? The first part of the verse refers to Lot’s separation from Avraham. The second is referring to Lot who caused contentions between Israel and Ammon, as it is said: *An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not join the assembly of Hashem.*

Rava, and some say Rav Yitzchak, taught: What does the verse mean when it says: *for desire will seek separation, and in all of the teaching will be denigration?* The first part of the verse is referring to Lot (who’s to satisfy his desires, separated from Avraham and went to live in Sedom). The second part of the verse is referring to the fact that his denigration is publicized in synagogues and study halls, as the *Mishna* states that an Ammonite and Moabite are forbidden forever.

Ulla said: Tamar was promiscuous, and Zimri was promiscuous. Tamar was promiscuous (because of her good intentions), but kings and prophets descended from her, while Zimri’s promiscuity led to tens of thousands of Jews being killed.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says: A sin that is done for the sake of Heaven is greater than a *mitzvah* that is not done with proper intent.

The *Gemora* asks: Didn’t Rav Yehudah say in the name of Rav that a person should always perform Torah and *mitzvos* even without the proper intent, as doing so leads to their performance for the sake of Heaven?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak must have meant that it is equal to a *mitzvah* performed without proper intent.

This (Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak’s teaching) is as the verse states: *She should be blessed from amongst the women, Yael, daughter of Chaver ha’Keini, from (implying possibly even more than) the women of the tent she should be*

blessed. Who are “the women of the tent?” They are Sarah, Rivkah, Rachel, and Leah (*the matriarchs of Israel*).

Rabbi Yochanan said: That evildoer (*Sisra*) had relations with her seven times that time (*day*). This is evident from the verse that states: *between her legs he bent, fell, slept*, etc. [*The verse uses seven seemingly extra words describing this event, which Rabbi Yochanan understands as implying that they had relations seven times.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Didn’t she enjoy these relations (*why, then, is this deemed such a great deed*)?

Rabbi Yochanan answers: All of the benefit that is bestowed by evildoers to the righteous is evil to them (*for he polluted her*). This is as it is written: [God told Lavan:] *Beware of speaking with Yaakov either good or bad*. Now it is understandable why he was warned not to speak bad, but why was he forbidden to say anything good? Rather, it is a proof from here that what is good to Lavan is bad for Yaakov; indeed, this is a proof. (23a2 – 23b2)

It was stated above: Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: A person should always perform Torah and *mitzvos* even without the proper intent, as doing so leads to their performance with proper intent. This is evident from the forty-two sacrifices that the wicked Balak brought, which for this, he merited that Rus should be one of his descendants. For Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina stated: Rus was the granddaughter of Eglon, king of Moab, who was the grandson of Balak, king of Moav. (23b2)

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: How do we know that Hashem does not even hold back reward for using refined speech? The eldest daughter of Lot who called her son Moav (*implying “from my father”*) caused the verse to state: *Do not oppress the Moabites and do not contend with them in battle*. This implies that while it was forbidden to go to war with them, it was

permitted to tax them (*through forcing them to supply the Jews with bread and water*). However, regarding the descendants of the child from the youngest daughter named “Amon” (*son of my people*), it is written: *Do not oppress them and do not contend with them*, implying that it was forbidden to confront them at all. [*This was due to her refined speech in this matter.*]

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korchah: At all times a man should try to be first in the performance of a *mitzvah*, as on account of the one night by which the elder daughter preceded the younger daughter (*in having relations with their father Lot*), she preceded her by four generations in having a descendant join the nation of Israel: Oved, Yishai, David and Solomon. For the younger had no descendant join Israel until Rechavam (*son of Solomon*), as it is written: *And the name of his mother was Naamah the Ammonite*. (23b2 – 24a1)

DAILY MASHAL

EATING GLUTTONOUSLY

Rabbah bar Chanah says in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: What does the verse mean when it says: *For the roads of Hashem are straight, the righteous will walk in them and the sinners will stumble in them*? It can be explained using a parable of two people who roasted their *Pesach* offerings. One ate it for the sake of the *mitzvah*, and one ate purely for the enjoyment. The one who ate it for the *mitzvah* represents “the righteous will walk in them,” and the one who ate it gluttonously represents “and the sinners will stumble in them.”

Rish Lakish asked: You are calling this person evil? It is true that he did not do the *mitzvah* in a choice manner, but he did perform the *mitzvah* of eating the *Pesach* offering?!

Rashi explains that the meaning of this *Gemora* is that the fellow ate from the *Pesach* offering, but he was not intending to fulfill his obligation; rather, he was merely eating to fill his desires. This, is similar to desert at the end of a meal; one does not need to eat it for he is full from other foods – he is merely eating to fulfill his desire.

Tosfos HaRosh writes that that we are referring to a person who is already full from other foods, and not that he is eating from the *Pesach* offering, he is not enjoying it at all; this is what is called gluttonous.

The *Gemora* had asked: Do you call this fellow a wicked person? Granted, he did not perform the *mitzvah* in the choicest manner, but he did eat from the *Pesach* offering!?

The Maharsha (in horayos) cites our Tosfos who says that we may infer from this *Gemora* that a gluttonous eating is not regarded as eating at all. This, however, is only according to the Tosfos HaRosh. According to Rashi, the *Gemora* was referring to a person who was merely eating to fulfill his desire. This is not gluttonous. This inference is challenged, however, from the *Gemora* in Yoma (80b) which states that someone who eats gluttonously on *Yom Kippur* is exempt, for it is not regarded as eating!?

Rabbeinu Tam answers that there are two types of gluttonous eating. One can be where he is so full that the food he is eating now will be repulsive to him; he is not deriving any pleasure at all from the food. This is what the *Gemora* says is not regarded as eating at all. However, there can be another type of gluttonous eating, and that is when one is full and not hungry; however, the food is not repulsive to him. This is considered eating.

The Maharsha asks: If so, our *Gemora* could have replied to Rish Lakish that the parable was in reference to the first type of gluttonous eater, one where he ate so much that the food is repulsive to him. He can be regarded as

wicked, for it is not regarded as if he ate from the *Pesach* offering!?

He answers that in the parable of the two people eating, the *Gemora* knew from the beginning that we were discussing the same type of case, and when one eats gluttonously (*where the food is repulsive to him*), that is not a case of eating at all; it is damaging to himself.