



שבת קודש פרשת עקב | מסכת נדרים דף מב'

INSIGHTS FROM OUR CHABUROS

According to whose opinion is entering one's property included in the neder?

המודר הנאה מחבירו לפני שביעית אונו יורד לתוך שדהו ואינו אוכל מן הנוטות

There are two distinct intents a person could have when he declares that he prohibits benefit to others. One intent may be that one disallows benefit from himself upon another person. Another intent is when one prohibits benefit from his possessions (מנכסיו) upon others. We must clarify which case is discussed in our Mishnah.

The Mishnah teaches that if Reuven pronounces a neder against Shimon, the result is that Shimon is prohibited entry into Reuven's field. Earlier, the Gemara (32b) presented a dispute between Rebbe Eliezer and Chachamim in this regard. It is understood that passing through someone's property (דריסת הרגל) is a courtesy which, although beneficial, is afforded without cost (ויתור). A property owner allows others to cross through his yard free of charge. Nevertheless, Rebbe Eliezer is of the opinion that such a favor is prohibited for someone who is denied benefit due to a neder. Chachamim hold that this is not prohibited in this case. Rabbi Akiva Eiger, in his commentary to the Mishnah (5:1), explains that even the Chachamim who are lenient in this regard, only permit דריסת הרגל when the neder is stated in terms of benefiting from the person himself (נודר ממנו). However, if the neder was stated in terms of not benefiting from his property (נודר מנכסיו), the Chachamim agree that crossing through his property is prohibited. In this case, we must admit that benefit is realized from the property, and it would not be allowed.

shows that the opinion of Beis Yosef is unlike that of Rabbi Akiva Eiger. The Tur (Y.D. #221) writes that if Reuven makes a neder prohibiting Shimon benefit from his property, Shimon may not walk across his yard. Beis Yosef explains that this is according to the opinion of Rebbe Eliezer, who holds that רותיו is prohibited. Apparently, Beis Yosef holds that even when the neder is expressed in terms of not benefiting from one's property, Chachamim would allow walking through. חידושי רבי שמואל explains that the rationale of Beis Yosef would be that although Reuven stated clearly that his property be restricted from being the vehicle for benefit for Shimon, Reuven's intent was only to limit benefit to the extent that he himself cares to provide. This, according to Chachamim, does not include cases of ויתור, and therefore crossing across his property would be allowed.

POINT TO PONDER

The Gemara says that if someone made a נדר before שביעית and then it became מודר can eat from fruits which are leaning out of the field. Since the original נדר included all fruit, now that some are permitted, why don't we say לוותר מקצתו הותר כולו and everything should be מותר?

Response to last week's Point to Ponder:

The Gemara says that a חולה forgets his learning. How is this connected to his illness? Is it an עונש just like the sickness is assumed to be?

מהרש"א writes that someone who was sick and recovered goes back to his youthful self. He bases this on the פסוק ישוב לימי עלומיו. Because he returns to his youth, it also means that what he learned since his youth is forgotten. According to this explanation it is a byproduct of his recovery and not an עונש.

STORIES OF THE DAF

The ownerless Esrog

המודר הנאה מחבירו

The Mishnah at the end of our daf discusses the laws that apply to a person whose friend made a vow prohibiting him from enjoying the benefit of any of the friend's assets. There was a certain wealthy man who owned several kosher esrogim. For some reason, he decided to vow not to have any benefit of one of his esrogim just a few days before Sukkos. A certain poor man who had no esrog of his own hit on what he thought was the perfect plan. He would take the wealthy man's "forbidden" esrog and use that. Although on the first day of Sukkos one must own the esrog used, the poor man assumed that this esrog was ownerless and could be used by anyone. When he mentioned this plan to a Rabbi, the scholar was unconvinced. "I don't recommend this. Who says you can just take his esrog and use it? Besides, if the man annuls his vow you will be in really big trouble!"

Eventually this question was placed before the Ben Ish Chai, zt"l. Could a poor man discharge his obligation on the first day of Sukkos using the wealthy man's esrog? The Ben Ish Chai replied, "According to both the Rashba and the Ran, the poor man was permitted to take the esrog and he discharges his obligation. However, the Maharshal states that he can only discharge his obligation with permission from the gevir, since the original owner still has the right to give it to tzedakah. Although the gevir excluded himself from use of the esrog, he didn't pronounce it hefker. Therefore, another cannot come along and discharge his obligation using that esrog without permission!"

HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Is it necessary to declare produce ownerless during Shemittah?

ארעא מי אפקרה

The land is also ownerless

Later authorities debate the issue of declaring produce ownerless during the Shemittah year. Does the produce become ownerless by virtue of Hashem's declaration, or perhaps it is the owner of the field who must declare the produce ownerless without Hashem's playing a role in that process. One practical difference between these two approaches is the status of produce that grows in the field of someone who is not observant and did not declare his produce to be ownerless. If the produce becomes ownerless by Hashem's declaration one would be permitted to take "his" produce but if the owner must declare his produce ownerless one would not be permitted to take produce from this person's field.

One of the sources that plays a role in this debate is our Gemara. The Gemara ruled that during Shemittah one is permitted to eat fruit from the field of someone from whom he may not benefit but he may not enter his property. The distinction between the ruling to allow eating the produce but disallowing entering his property was challenged and two resolutions to the challenge are recorded. Maharit¹ cited a version of the Gemara which reads, ארעא נמי רחמנא אפקרה—the land is also declared ownerless by Hashem, and accordingly demonstrates that it is Hashem who makes property ownerless during the Shemittah year. Sefer Pe'as Hashulchan² rejects this proof based on our version of the Gemara that reads, ארעא נמי אפקרה—the land is ownerless due to the declaration of the owner.

The Shevet HaLevi³ demonstrated from our Gemara that the produce becomes ownerless by Hashem without input from the owner. The Gemara states that if one made a vow prohibiting his friend from benefiting from his property during Shemittah the produce is permitted, since the vow does not take effect on ownerless property, but he may not enter the other's field. Now, if one accepted the premise that the produce is ownerless only when declared so by the owner, it is possible for the vow to take effect even on the produce. That would happen when the owner did not declare the produce ownerless when he made the vow during the Shemittah year. This, concludes Shevet Halevi, is conclusive proof that it is Hashem that makes the produce ownerless.

1. שו"ת מהרי"ט ח"א סי' מ"ג
2. ספר פאת השלחן סי' כ"ג ס"ק כ"ט
3. שו"ת שבט הליי ח"י סי' ר"א אות ב'

REVIEW AND REMEMBER

1. Why is there a difference whether a person took a vow regarding food before or after shemittah?
2. How did the Gemara initially suggest to explain the dispute between Rav and Shmuel versus R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish?
3. Is there a difference whether one in his vow prohibits ?
4. What are the restrictions that apply to business when one person is prohibited from benefiting from another?

PARSHA CONNECTION

In this week's daf the Mishna discusses a מוֹדֵר eating fruit from the מוֹדֵר's field on שביעית. The source for the ברכה which we make after eating is in this week's עקב עקב.

The Possuk implies a connection between benching and Eretz Yisroel. The Possuk (דברים פרק ח פסוק י) says:

ואכלת ושבעת וברכת את-ה' אלוֹקֶיךָ עַל-הָאָרֶץ הַטֹּבָה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן

לָךְ. The אלשיך הקדוש explains the relationship as follows: We say in the second ברכה of המזון ברכת, thank you for the land. (על הארץ הטובה שהנחלת לאבותינו). Meaning the good land which you gave our forefathers. While we say this נוסח today, when יהושע first introduced this ברכה it said

"שהנחלת לנו" meaning which you gave to us, because he entered Eretz Yisroel for the first time with ישראל. We say שהנחלת לאבותינו because unfortunately we went into galus and we are no longer living in Eretz Yisroel. The Torah is telling us that if we bench properly and are careful about the mitzvos, we will be zoche to always say "שהנחלת לנו".

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Yitzchok Gutterman, please visit our website, dafaweek.org, or download the app

To share an insight from your Chabura please email info@dafaweek.org

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita

To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at info@dafaweek.org or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100

Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center