

Nedarim 37a

Why Is One Allowed to Charge for Teaching Mikra But is Not Allowed to Charge for Teaching Medrash Etc.

The Gemara established that our Mishna is discussing a case in which the custom was to charge for teaching Mikra but not for teaching Medrash etc. And on this the Gemara asked why the Mishna choose to pick this particular case.

The Gemara now answers

הא קא משמע לן דאפילו במקום שנוטלין שכר על המקרא (but) for (teaching) Mikra לא שרי למשקל (but) for (teaching) Medrash it is not permitted to take³⁹

The Ran explains that the entire question with regard to if Shimon is allowed to teach Reuven or not is only relevant to the question if Shimon is saving Reuven the teacher's fee or not.

However, the actual learning that Reuven is doing as a result of Shimon's teaching is not considered a benefit. That is, although one certainly benefits when he is taught Torah (as he gets the mitzvah of learning), with regard to the halachos of one who is assur to receive benefit, the learning of Torah is not considered a benefit as we have the rule of מציאת לאו ליהנות ניתנו, that the benefit that comes from a mitzvah is not considered as a benefit.

Therefore, the only reason it would be assur for Shimon to teach Reuven is as a result of the money that Shimon is saving Reuven, and if so, we understand the difference between the teaching of Mikra and the teaching of Medrash. The Gemara tells us that one is only allowed to charge for the teaching of

Mikra and therefore in a town that they charge for the teaching of Mikra, Shimon would not be allowed to teach Reuven Mikra for free. Doing so will be considered as a benefit for Reuven as he is being taught without the need to pay the teacher's fee that is normally charged for this teaching.

However, although one is allowed to charge for the teaching of Mikra, one is not allowed to charge for the teaching of Medrash and therefore Shimon will be allowed to teach Medrash to Reuven in any location. Since one is not allowed to charge for this teaching, when Shimon teaches Reuven, Shimon is not saving Reuven money and therefore it is not considered as he is benefitting him.

The Gemara asks now asks why this distinction is true. If one is not allowed to charge for teaching Medrash, why is he allowed to charge for teaching Mikra?

What is the difference מאי שניא (with regard to) Medrash מדרש that no (i.e., he can't take payment) דלא as it is written (Devarim 4:14) דקתיב "ואתני צוה ה' ואתי צוה ה' בעת ההיא ללמד אתכם at that time to teach you" וכתוב (ibid. 5) "ראה למדתי אתכם ראה למדתי אתכם (chukim (halachos that are not understood) חקים and mispatim (halachos that are understood) ומשפטים as Hashem commanded me" ה' כפאשר צוני ה' as Hashem commanded me"

Based on these two pesukim the Gemara makes the drasha and says that Moshe was saying:

מה אני בחנם נמי בחנם
so too you should be for free

That is, Moshe was telling Klal Yisroel that just like he taught Klal Yisroel for free, so too every person is obligated to teach Torah for free (see footnote for how this is seen from the posuk).⁴⁰

³⁹ The Case of the Gemara (if the 'real' difference between the cases is if one is teaching Mikra or if one is teaching Medrash, why did the Mishna not just say this difference and not mention the locations at all?)

The Ran explains the case of the Gemara as follows. As the Gemara said, it is assur to charge for teaching Medrash but not for Mikra. However, there were places in which they were machmir to not charge even for teaching Mikra. They had this chumrah because they were afraid that if people would charge for teaching Mikra, they might come to charge for teaching Medrash as well.

As such, in these places, Shimon would be allowed to teach Reuven Mikra, because by doing so, Shimon would not be saving Reuven any money.

The chiddush of the Mishna is that in a place that they would charge for teaching Mikra, Shimon would then not be allowed to teach Reuven (because by doing so, Shimon would be saving Reuven money). However, although Shimon would not be allowed to teach Reuven Mikra in this location, Shimon would be allowed to teach Reuven Medrash. And this is what Shmuel meant when he said that even in a place that takes payment for Mikra, you are only allowed to take payment for Mikra and not Medrash

Seemingly the Ran was bothered with this that Shmuel mentioned the word 'locations'. That is, if the difference between teaching Mikra and teaching Medrash is that for Mikra you are allowed to charge but for Medrash you are not, Shmuel should have just said so. He should have said that the Mishna is teaching us this halacha, that one can charge for Mikra but not Medrash. But Shmuel does not just do this, and he also mentions 'locations'. Therefore, the Ran explains that indeed the halacha of the Mishna will depend on the custom of each location as he explained.

⁴⁰ Understanding the Gemara's Drasha (how do we know that Moshe taught for free?)

The Ran explains that this is learned out from the last posuk that says that Moshe says that he taught Klal Yisroel the way that Hashem commanded him. What does it mean that he taught the way Hashem commanded him? What do the words 'as Hashem commanded him' add? The Gemara learns that it must be that Hashem commanded him to teach for free. The Ran points out that one cannot say that it means that Hashem commanded Moshe to teach them for

But on this, the Gemara asks the obvious question.

(But) Mikra should also be for free מִקְרָא נְמִי בְּחִנָּם

If it is really true that the previous posuk teaches us that the Torah must be taught for free, why would the teaching of Mikra be different? After all, that very posuk is describing Moshe teaching Klal Yisroel all of the Torah, Mikra included.

The Gemara answers that when we say that one is allowed to charge for the teaching of Torah, this is not referring to the actual teaching of the Torah but rather to the other things that the act of teaching entails, as will be explained.

Rav said **רַב אָמַר**

(he received) payment for watching שְׂכַר שִׁמּוֹר

and R' Yochanan said **רַבֵּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר**

(he receives) payment שְׂכַר

for (teaching) the 'trop' פִּיּוּק טְעָמִים

The Ran explains that Rav is answering that typically a person who is teaching Mikra, is teaching children. Therefore, the teacher is allowed to accept payment because although he cannot take payment for the actual learning itself, he is allowed to take payment for this that he watches the children as he teaches them.

R' Yochanan answers that the Mishna is referring to accepting payment for the teaching of the trop. R' Yochanan holds that the trop is not M'Dorayisa and is therefore not included in the issur of teaching Torah.⁴¹

The Ran points out that a practical halacha difference between Rav and R' Yochanan is if one is allowed to accept payment for teaching an adult trop. According to Rav it will be assur as Rav holds that the trop is M'Dorayisa, and as such, he holds that one can't accept payment for it. And in this case, we cannot say that the teacher is accepting the payment for the watching that he is doing because an adult does not need to be watched.

However, according to R' Yochanan it will be mutur to teach an adult trop. R' Yochanan holds that since trop is not M'Dorayisa, there is no issur to accept payment for teaching it, and it will not make a difference if he is teaching and child or if he is teaching an adult.

payment because we never find such a chiyuv that Moshe had to accept payment for teaching. After all, could it really be that if Moshe would not want to accept payment he would be forced to do so? This would seem to be non-sensical. How could it be that Moshe would be forced to accept payment if he wouldn't want to?

The Ran continues and says that it cannot be that the point of saying that it was "as Hashem commanded" was to assure Klal Yisroel that Moshe was really saying the word of Hashem as opposed to Moshe just saying what he wanted to. At that time, Klal Yisroel trusted Moshe and if Moshe would teach them Torah, they would believe that it was obviously from Hashem and Moshe would not have to 'certify' his words by saying 'as Hashem commanded me'.

The Gemara will now bring a proof from our Mishna to one of the two previous shitos.

תָּנַן We learned in a the Mishna

לֹא לְמַדְּנוּ מִקְרָא you cannot teach him Mikra

The Mishna told us that if it is assur for Shimon to give benefit to Reuven, Shimon is not allowed to teach Mikra to Reuven. And on this the Gemara asks:

בְּשִׁלְמָא It is good

לְמֵאן דְּאָמַר (according) to the one who said

שְׂכַר the payment (is for teaching)

פִּיּוּק טְעָמִים 'the trop'

הֵיִינוּ this is (what it means)

דְּלֹא לְמַדְּנוּ that he cannot teach him

אֶלְמֵאן דְּאָמַר but (according) to the one who says

שְׂכַר it is the payment

שִׁמּוֹר for watching (that one is allowed to charge)

גְּדוּל an adult

בְּרַ שִׁמּוֹר הוּא is someone who needs watching?!

The Mishna says that Shimon is not allowed to teach Reuven Mikra because normally one is allowed to charge for teaching Mikra, and therefore, when Shimon teaches Reuven Mikra for free, Reuven is saving the normal fee that he would be charged for being taught.

But if it is true that the only reason that you are ever allowed to charge for teaching Mikra, is because when you charge for the teaching of Mikra you are really charging for the watching of the one being taught, this would obviously not apply in the case of an adult.

Therefore, why would Shimon not be allowed to teach Reuven Mikra. Since Shimon is not allowed to charge for the teaching Reuven Mikra (as Reuven as an adult does not need watching), when Shimon does teach Reuven Mikra, Shimon is not saving Reuven any money.

However, according to R' Yochanan we understand the Mishna very well. According to R' Yochanan the reason why one is allowed to charge for teaching Mikra is because he is charging for the teaching of the trop. If so, this would certainly apply to an

Left with no alternative, the Gemara says that the words "as Hashem commanded me" must be coming to say that Hashem commanded him to teach the Torah for free, and once we know that Moshe taught Klal Yisroel for free, this tells us that we must teach for free as well.

41 What is the 'Trop' that the Gemara is referring to?

Seemingly what we refer to as 'trop' includes two things, the way to 'sing' the Torah, and the way to punctuate the Torah. That is, the Torah obviously does not have punctuation marks, and as such, we will need to know how to punctuate the Torah. That is, where phrases start, end, etc.

adult as well, and therefore we understand this that our Mishna says that Shimon cannot teach Reuven Mikra.

The Gemara answers:

The Mishna is dealing with a katon (child) בְּקָטָן קֵתְנִי

The Gemara answers that when our Mishna says that Shimon is not allowed to teach Reuven Mikra, it is referring to a case in which Reuven is a katon, and if so, normally Shimon would be allowed to charge for this, and therefore when he teaches Reuven, he will be benefiting Reuven, something that he is not allowed to do.⁴²

But on this the Gemara asks:

If (the Mishna is dealing) with a katon אִי בְּקָטָן

say the sayfa אֵימָא סִיפָא

(the sayfa says) but you can teach אָבָל מְלַמֵּד

his sons Mikra אֶת בְּנָיו מִקְרָא

The sayfa of the Mishna says that although Shimon cannot teach Reuven Mikra, he can teach Reuven's sons Mikra. And on this the Gemara asks the obvious question:

(But is) a katon קָטָן

בְּרֵב בְּנִים הוּא? someone who can have sons?! הוּא

The Gemara points out that the person being discussed in the Mishna cannot be a katon because the sayfa of the Mishna discusses this person having children, something that a katon cannot do.

The Gemara answers:

It (the Mishna) is missing (words) חֲסוּרֵי מַחְסָרָא

and this is how it should be learned וְהֵכִי קֵתְנִי

and he cannot teach Mikra לֹא יִלְמְדֵנוּ מִקְרָא

to a katon בְּקָטָן

(but) if he is a gadol אִם הִיא גָדוֹל

he can teach him מְלַמְדוֹ לוֹ

and his children Mikra וְלְבָנָיו מִקְרָא

The Gemara answers that the correct way to learn the Mishna is that the Mishna is saying that Shimon is not allowed to teach Reuven if Reuven is a katon, and if Reuven is a gadol, then not only can Shimon teach Reuven, but Reuven can even teach Reuven's children.

The Ran explains that Shimon is allowed to teach Reuven if Reuven is an adult, as an adult does not need watching. And

⁴² **Why Can't Shimon Cause Reuven (the katon) to Benefit from Him?**

The Ran explains that even though if we see a katon doing something that is assur we are not obligated to stop the katon, we are not allowed to be the cause of this katon doing the issur. Therefore, since it is assur for Reuven to benefit from Shimon, Shimon is not allowed to teach him Mikra, because by doing so, Shimon is causing Reuven to do an avayra (i.e., he is causing Reuven to benefit from him, something that Reuven is not allowed to do).

One might still be able to ask why this is considered as a benefit for Reuven. If Reuven is really a katon, then he would never pay for someone to teach him,

Shimon is even allowed to teach Reuven's children. The Ran explains that even though in the case that Shimon will teach Reuven's children, Reuven benefits from the fact that he does not have to hire a teacher for his children, this is not considered a forbidden benefit, similar to this that the Mishna will teach us that Shimon would be allowed to give food to Reuven's children.

Even though when Shimon gives food to Reuven's children, Shimon saves Reuven the money that he would have otherwise needed to have spent to pay food for his children, this is only considered as an indirect benefit.

As the Ran will explain later on (Daf 38), since the intent of Shimon is to fulfill the mitzvah of feeding the children and not to pay up Reuven's debt, the benefit that Reuven does get is only considered incidental benefit and is therefore not assur.

If so, in our case as well, the benefit that Reuven receives from not having to hire a teacher for his children is only considered as incidental benefit as Shimon's intent is to do the mitzvah of teaching Reuven's children, and not to pay for Reuven's obligation.

TO SUMMARIZE: The Gemara answers that there are three halachos with regard to Shimon teaching Reuven Mikra.

1. If Reuven is an adult, Shimon is allowed to teach him.
2. If Reuven is a child, Shimon is not allowed to teach him.
3. Shimon is allowed to teach Reuven's children Mikra.
- 4.

What Can Children Be Taught on Shabbos?

They asked from a Baraisa מִיתִיבֵי

children תִּינוּקוֹת

cannot read for the first time לֹא קוֹרִין בְּתַחֲלִילָה

on Shabbos בַּשַּׁבָּת

but they can review אָלֵא שׁוֹנִין

for the first time (on Shabbos) בְּרֵאשׁוֹן

The Baraisa tells us that children cannot be taught new material (i.e., material that they have never learned before) on Shabbos, but they are allowed to review for the first time on Shabbos. And on this the Gemara asks:

It is good בְּשִׁלְמָא

(according) to the one who says לְמֵאן דְאָמַר

and if so, why is it considered as if Shimon is saving him money by teaching him for free? Granted Shimon might want to demand money from Reuven's father, but can he really demand money from Reuven himself?

Perhaps one can answer that even if practically Shimon cannot get money from Reuven, since the service that Shimon gave Reuven is 'chargeable' this is enough to give the teaching value, and as such, that is why it would be assur for Shimon to teach Reuven, וַיִּשׁ לְפַלְפֵּל.

(that it is) payment שְׂכָר
 (for teaching) 'trop' (that one is allowed to take) פִּיּוּק טְעָמִים
 this is (what the Baraisa tells us) הִינוּ
 that one cannot read (learn) דָּאֵין קוֹרֵין
 for the first time בְּתַחִילָה
 on Shabbos בְּשַׁבָּת
 but (according) to the one that says אֵלָא לְמַאן דְּאָמַר
 (it is the) payment שְׂכָר
 for watching (that one is allowed to take) שִׁמּוֹר
 why אֲמַאי
 can one not read אֵין קוֹרֵין
 for the first time on Shabbos בְּתַחִילָה בְּשַׁבָּת
 and why אֲמַאי
 can one review שׁוֹנֵין
 for the first time (on Shabbos) בְּרֵאשׁוֹן
 but there is הָאֵיכָא
 the payment for the watching שְׂכָר שִׁמּוֹר
 on Shabbos בְּשַׁבָּת

The Ran explains the Gemara's question as follows. When one teaches trop, he mainly takes payment for the first time that he teaches it but he does not charge for the review. This is because the main work that a teacher must do is to teach the student the trop for the first time. However, once the student learns the trop it is relatively easy to review it.

If so, we can understand why one is not allowed to teach Mikra for the first time on Shabbos but one is allowed to review it. This is because if he teaches it for the first time, it comes out that the teacher is taking payment for work that he is doing on Shabbos, something that he is not allowed to do. And the teacher is allowed to review with the student on Shabbos, as the teacher does not take payment for the review.

But according to Rav, the reason a teacher of Mikra is allowed to take payment is only for the watching that he is doing. But if so, what is the difference between the first time the Mikra is being learned and between the time that it is being reviewed? In both cases the child needs to be watched, and if so, both cases should be assur on Shabbos.

But on this question the Gemara asks:

But according to your reasoning וְלִיטְעָמִיךָ
 the payment שְׂכָר
 (for teaching) trop (for the first time) פִּיּוּק
 on Shabbos בְּשַׁבָּת
 is it assur מִי אָסוּר
 (but) it is 'havlahah' הִיא הַבְּלָעָה
 and 'havlahah' is mutur מִי שְׂרָא שְׂרִי

The root of the word 'havlahah' comes from the word to swallow and refers to the concept that one is allowed to pay for work that is to be done over many days even if one of those days is Shabbos. That is, we don't look at it as if the person is being paid for Shabbos, rather he is being paid for the complete job and the fact that one of those days happens to be Shabbos is incidental.

If so, here too as well we should say the same. This teacher is being paid for teaching this student the trop over the course of many days. If so, why can he not teach him the trop for the first time on Shabbos? Granted one is not allowed to pay someone to work for him on Shabbos, but this should be considered a case of 'halva' as he is paying him for other days as well. If so, this Baraisa is not only a question on Rav but it is a question on R' Yochanan as well.

Before the Gemara answers its question, it brings a source that 'havlahah' is indeed mutur.

The next Baraisa describes the payment of those who would guard three things: the parah adumah, the children who would draw the water in which the ashes of the parah adumah would be placed, and the grain that would be brought for the korban omer.

The Baraisa tells us:

As we learned in a Baraisa דִּתְנִיָא
 one who hires a worker הַשׂוֹכֵר אֶת הַפּוֹעֵל
 to watch the child לְשִׁמּוֹר אֶת הַתֵּינוּקָא
 to watch the cow לְשִׁמּוֹר אֶת הַפָּרָה
 (or) to watch the plantings לְשִׁמּוֹר אֶת הַזְּרָעִים
 we do not give him אֵין נוֹתְנִין לוֹ
 payment for Shabbos שְׂכָר שַׁבָּת
 therefore לְכִיכָד

Nedarim 37b

if it gets lost (on Shabbos) אם אבדו

he is not obligated אינו חייב

for its responsibility (i.e., he does not have to pay for it) באחריותו

But if he was hired for the week ואם היה שכיר שבת

(or if) he was hired for the month שכיר חדש

(or if) he was hired for the year שכיר שנה

(or if) he was hired for a 'shavua' (a seven-year period) שכיר שבע

(then) we give him לו נתנו

payment for Shabbos שכר שבת

therefore לפיכך

if it gets lost (on Shabbos) אם אבדו

he is chayiv in its responsibility (i.e., he has to pay for it) חייב באחריותו

The Baraisa tells us that if a watchman is hired on a day-by-day basis to watch one of these three items, he cannot be paid for Shabbos, as it is assur to be paid for working on Shabbos. Therefore, since this watchman is not being paid for Shabbos, he is only considered as a שומר חנם – an unpaid watchman, and as such, he will not be responsible if the thing that he is watching gets lost on Shabbos (i.e., damaged or destroyed) due to anything other than his own negligence.

The Baraisa continues and says that if this person is not being hired per day but rather he is hired either to guard the object for a week, a month, a year, or for a seven-year period, in all of these cases, he can be paid for Shabbos. For example, if the going rate for a watchman is ten dollars per day, he is allowed to be paid seventy dollars for the week. That is, even though he is being paid for Shabbos, since this payment for Shabbos is not explicit but rather it is 'swallowed up' in the general payment, he is allowed to take it.

The Baraisa concludes that since he is being paid for Shabbos, he is now considered as a שומר שכר – a paid watchman, and as such, if the item gets lost he will be responsible for it.

We see from this Baraisa what the Gemara is trying to prove, that any time one is being paid for working on Shabbos through 'havlah' the payment for Shabbos is permitted. If so, why can this person not teach Mikra to children on Shabbos? Granted he is being paid for his watching the children on Shabbos, but this should be mutur with the concept of 'havlah'. The teacher is certainly not just teaching the child on Shabbos, and if so, he should be able to be paid for his 'working on Shabbos' with the payment for all of his teaching.

If so, the reason he cannot teach the children for the first time on Shabbos cannot be because he is being paid for his teaching

but rather this must be another reason why he cannot be taught for the first time of Shabbos.

Various Reasons Why One Cannot Teach Mikra to Children for the First Time on Shabbos

Rather with regard to Shabbos אלא גבי שבת

this is the reason היינו טעמא

that they can't read דאין קוראין

for the first (time) בתחילה

(this is) 'so that' (lit. because) משום

the fathers of the children should 'turn' דיפנו אבהתהון דינוקי

to the mitzvah of Shabbos למצותא דשבתא

The Ran explains that the reason why children cannot learn Mikra for the first time on Shabbos is in order to allow the fathers to be involved with the mitzvahs of Shabbos and to enjoy Shabbos together with their children. If children will be taught Mikra for the first time on Shabbos, their fathers will not be willing to stop them from their learning, and as such, they will not be able to spend quality time with them (however the fathers will be willing to interrupt their children if they are just reviewing old material, presumably because the review is not as important or as difficult).

Tosefos explains that one cannot teach children for the first time on Shabbos because learning new material takes a long time and by the child learning this new material the father to have to wait for him in order to start the seudah. Reviewing old material takes much less time, and as such, this would not be a concern.

And if you want I can say ואיבעית אימא

because on Shabbos משום דבשבתא

(one) eats and drinks (more than usual) אכלין ושתין

(and therefore) "the world will be heavy on עליהון עלמא

them" (i.e., they will be tired)

as Shmuel said כדאמר שמואל

the change of the 'vest' (i.e., usual way of doing things) שינוי וסת

is the beginning of stomach illness תחילת חולי מעיים

Since we eat and drink more than usual on Shabbos, this will cause the children to become tired and therefore they will not be able to put in the effort that is needed to learn new material.

The Two Reasons Why One is Allowed to Charge for Teaching Mikra – Why Did Each Shita Not Want to Learn Like the Other?

Previously we brought the machlokes between Rav and R' Yochanan as to why one is allowed to charge for teaching Mikra. Rav said that one is allowed to charge for teaching Mikra as typically when one is teaching Mikra he is teaching children, and as such, the teacher needs to be paid, not for the actual teaching but for the watching of the children.

R' Yochanan held that when we say that one is allowed to charge for teaching Mikra, this is referring to charging for the teaching of the 'trop' but not for the teaching of the actual Mikra.

The Gemara now explains why each shita did not hold like the other one.

And (according) to the one that said **וְלִמְאֵן דְּאָמַר**
 (it is) payment of **שְׂכָר**
 (the teaching of) 'trop' **פִּיּוּק טַעְמִים**
 what is the reason **מֵאִי טַעְמָא**
 he did not say **לָא אָמַר**
 (it is) payment for watching (the children) **שְׂכָר שִׁימור**

The Gemara answers:

He holds **קָסְבַּר**
 daughters **בְּנוֹת**
 do they need watching?!⁴³ **מִי קָא בְּעֵינֵי שִׁימור**

R' Yochanan did not what to says that the payment is for the watching because one is allowed to pay someone to teach his daughters as well, and daughters do not need watching. If so, the payment has to be for something else.

And (according) to the one that said **וְלִמְאֵן דְּאָמַר**
 (it is) payment for watching **שְׂכָר שִׁימור**
 what is the reason **מֵאִי טַעְמָא**
 he did not say **לָא אָמַר**
 (that it is) payment **שְׂכָר**
 (for the teaching of the) 'trop' **פִּיּוּק טַעְמִים**

The Gemara answers:

He holds that the 'trop' **שְׂכָר פִּיּוּק טַעְמִים**
 is M'Dorayisa **הוּא דְּאוּרְיִתָּא הוּא**

The Gemara answers that Rav holds that trop is also M'Dorayisa (i.e., it is part of Torah), and as such, it is included in the **חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים** that must be taught for free.

⁴³ The Ran's Girsas of the Gemara's Question

The Ran has a different girsas in the Gemara. In the Ran's girsas the Gemara asks "And does an adult need watching?!". The Mishna said one is not allowed to teach an adult Mikra (in the case of a neder) and the sayfa of the Mishna

The Source that Trop is M'Dorayisa

The Gemara now brings the source that trop is M'Dorayisa . The posuk that the Gemara quotes is a posuk that describes Ezra reading the Torah to Klal Yisroel. The Gemara will first quote the entire posuk and then explain what specifically each phrase of the posuk is referring to.

As Rav Ika bar Avin said **דְּאָמַר רַב אֵיקָא בְּרַב אֲבִין**
 that Rav Chananel said **אָמַר רַב חֲנַנְיָל**
 that Rav said **אָמַר רַב**
 what (it the meaning) **מֵאִי**
 of this that is written (Nechemia 8:8) **דְּכָתִיב**
 "They read in the sefer **וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְּסֵפֶר**
 in Hashem's Torah **בְּתוֹרַת הָאֱלֹקִים**
 explained **מְפָרֵשׁ**
 and with paying attention to intelligence **וְשׂוּם שְׂקָל**
 and they understood the reading" **וַיְבִינּוּ בְּמִקְרָא**

The Gemara now explains each phrase of the posuk.
 'And they read in the sefer, in the **וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְּסֵפֶר בְּתוֹרַת הָאֱלֹקִים**
 Torah of Hashem'

this refers to **זָה**
 the (actual) Mikra (i.e., the pesukim) **מִקְרָא**

The next part of the posuk:

'Explained' **מְפָרֵשׁ**
 this refers to **זָה**

the Targum (i.e., Targum Unkelos) **תַּרְגוּם**

The next part of the posuk:

And with paying attention to intelligence **וְשׂוּם שְׂקָל**
 these are the pesukim **אֵלּוּ הַפְּסוּקִים**

The Ran explains that this refers to the dots that would separate the words into individual pesukim, i.e., the colon that we find in between the pesukim. This is referred to as 'שְׂקָל' as by separating the words into pesukim we understand their meaning.

And the last part of the posuk:

'And they understood the Mikra' **וַיְבִינּוּ בְּמִקְרָא**
 this refers to the trop **זָה פִּיּוּק טַעְמִים**
 and some say **וְאָמְרֵי לָהּ**
 these are the Mesoros **אֵלּוּ הַמְּסוּרוֹת**

describes this person's children. If so, it must be that the raysha is discussing a gadol, and on this the Gemara asks "Does a gadol need watching?" An adult does not need to be watched, and if so, why would one be allowed to teach him Mikra (if not for the neder)?

According to the first explanation of the words **בְּמִקְרָא**, וְיָבִיטוּ, this phrase refers to the trop, and as such, we have a source that the trop is M'Dorayisa.

According to the second explanation the words refer to the mesorah. This is the tradition of how to spell certain words. Certain words in the Torah are at times spelled 'fully' i.e., with all of their letters, and at times they can be spelled without all of their letters (i.e., certain letters only represent nekudos (vowels), for example the letter 'vov', and as such, they do not need to be included in the word.) Mesoros refers to the tradition that tells us when we do write all the words letters and when we do not use all of a word's letters.

Four Example of Ways to Read/Write the Pesukim That Are Only Known Through a Halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai

R' Yitzchok now brings four things that are only known from a halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai. We will first state them and then explain what each one refers to.

אמר רבי יצחק

מקרא

of the Sofrim (i.e. how to read the Torah) סופרים

And the adding (beatification) ועיטור

of the Sofrim סופרים

And (those words) that are read וקריין

and not written ולא כתיבן

And (those) words that are written וכתיבן

but not read ולא קריין

(All of them are) a halacha הלכה

L'Moshe M'Sinai למשה מסיני

The four things are as follows:

1. **מקרא סופרים** – The Ran explains that this refers to the correct way to pronounce the words. This was something that the Sofrim passed down as a mesorah from the earlier Rishonim (early sages). Hence the term **מקרא סופרים** – the reading of the Sofrim.
2. **עיטור סופרים** – The Ran explains that this refers to those extra words that were added in order to beautify the expressions of the Torah, i.e., they are not necessary in

order to understand the pesukim but rather they were added just to add to the beauty of the language of the Torah. The Ran explains that this is the meaning of the term **עיטור סופרים**, the adoration/crowning of the Sofrim. Indeed, these words were written to crown the language of the Torah.

3. **קריין ולא כתיבן** – Read but not written. This refers to those words that are read but not written, as will be explained.
4. **כתיבן ולא קריין** – Written and not read. This refers to those words that are written but not read, as will be explained.

The Gemara now gives example for each one of these.

The reading of the Sofrim **מקרא סופרים**

(refers to the words) **אָרָץ**

שָׁמַיִם (and) **מִצְרַיִם**

Tosefos explains that the words **ארץ שמים מצרים** can be pronounced in one of two ways. If they have an **אָתְנַחְתָּא** under them, or if they are at the end of a posuk, they are pronounced as **אָרָץ־שָׁמַיִם מִצְרַיִם**. And if not, they are pronounced as **אָרָץ־שָׁמַיִם מִצְרַיִם**. This difference in pronunciation is what the Sofrim taught as a halacha L'Moshe M'Sinai. (See footnote for the Ran's explanation of the Gemara).⁴⁴

The Gemara continues:

(The term) the adding/beatification **עיטור**

of the Sofrim (refers to the phrases) **סופרים**

(The posuk Bereisis 18:5) says “**אחר**

תעברו” you should pass on”

This posuk is referring to Avrohom Avinu asking the malachim to please take food from him. He tells them that after they have eaten and become satisfied, they will then be able to pass on to the rest of their journey. The posuk says **וְסַעְדוּ לְבָבְכֶם** וְאַחַר תַּעֲבֵרוּ - and you will be satisfied and afterwards you will pass on (i.e., you will continue on your journey). The posuk did not have to say the word **אחר**, because if the posuk would have just said **וְסַעְדוּ לְבָבְכֶם וְתַעֲבֵרוּ** - you will be satisfied and pass on, the understanding of the posuk would stay the same. As such, this is an example of what the Gemara means that certain words were

⁴⁴ **The Ran's explanation of the what the Sofrim Taught us with Regard to How to Read the Words ארץ שמים מצרים**

The Ran explains the word **ארץ** as Tosefos does, but with regard to the words **שמים מצרים**, he explains that the Sofrim taught that they should be pronounced as if they have the letter 'alef' even though they do not.

That is, the letter 'yud' can either be used just as a nekuda or it can be used a letter as well. (similar to the letter 'vov' that can either be used as an actual letter or it can be used just as a way to have the nekuda cholom).

If the letter 'yud' in the words **ארץ שמים מצרים** is just being used as a nekuda, then the words would be pronounced as “sha'mim” and “Mitz'rim”.

But now that the Sofrim tell us that these words should be read as if there is an 'aleph' before the 'yud' this means that the cheirek is on the 'alef' and the letter 'yud' will be read as a letter, and if so, the words **ארץ שמים מצרים** are pronounced as we pronounce them, sha'ma'yim and Mitz'ra'yim.

added just to beautify the wording of the pesukim, even though they were not strictly needed from an information standpoint.

The Gemara brings four more examples of this. For the sake of simplicity, we will just translate these examples and will only explain them in the footnotes.

”Then she will go” אַחַר תֵּלֶךְ
 “Then she will be gathered in” אַחַר תֵּאַסֵּף
 “The singers went first
 and then those playing instruments” אַחַר נִגְנִים
 “Their tziddkus (righteousness)
 are like mountains of Hashem” אַחַר קָל פְּהַרְרֵי

In the first three examples the word אַחַר is unnecessary as even if the posuk would not say the word אַחַר, we would know the meaning of the posuk is that the ‘next thing’ will happen afterwards. In the last example, the letter ‘כ’ is unnecessary as even without the posuk writing it, we would still know that the posuk is comparing the malachim to the mountains, see footnote for further explanation of these four examples.⁴⁵

Words of the Tanach that Are Read Even Though they Are Not Written in the Pesukim

The Gemara now brings the examples of words that are read even though they are not written in the pesukim. When these

45 The Next Four Examples of the Gemara in which Words Are Used Not Because they are Needed but Rather they Are Used to Beautify the Language of the Pesukim

In the first example, the posuk is describing how Lavan is asking Eliezer not to take Rivka right away. Rather she should stay with them for an amount of time and only afterwards should she go to marry Yitzchok. The point of the Gemara is that even without the posuk writing the word אַחַר, we would know that this was their intent.

The next posuk describes how Miriam was sent out of the camp for seven days when she contracted tzaras for speaking lashon hara against Moshe. The posuk is saying that after the seven days she will be able to come back. Once again, the point of the Gemara is that even without the word אַחַר we would know the intent of the posuk.

The next posuk is describing those singing shira to Hashem and the posuk says that first the singers went and then the musicians, something that we would have known from the posuk even if the posuk would not have used the word אַחַר.

The last example is the posuk that compares the malachim to the mighty mountains. The Ran explains that even if the posuk would not have used the letter ‘כ’, we would still know that this was the intent of the posuk. And indeed, the very next posuk makes a similar comparison without using the letter ‘כ’. The posuk says משִׁפְטֵיךְ תְּהוּם רִבָּה – your judgements are like the great depths. That is, the posuk compares Hashem’s judgements to the great depths without using a ‘כ’, and if so, we see that the comparison can be made even without a ‘כ’ and if a ‘כ’ is used, it is not because it is needed but rather it is just to enhance the flow of the words.

pesukim are read, they are read as if these words are written there, even though they aren’t.

Once again, we will just translate the words of the Gemara and only explain the various examples in the footnotes.⁴⁶

(The examples of those words) that are read קָרְיִין
 but not written וְלֹא פְתִיבֹן
 (the word) ‘Paras’ פָּרַת
 (from the posuk) of ‘that he went’ דְּבָלְתָו
 (The word) ‘Man’ אִישׁ
 (from the posuk of) “Like דְּכֹאֲשֵׁר
 the ‘man’ that might ask ‘אִישׁ’
 for the word of Hashem” דְּבִדְבַר הָאֱלֹקִים
 (The word) “are coming” בָּאִים
 (from the posuk of) “it will be built” דְּנִבְנְתָהּ
 (The word) “of her” לָהּ
 (from the posuk of) “leftover” דְּפְלִיטָה
 (The word) “es” אֵת
 (from the posuk of) “it will be told” דְּהִגִּד הִגִּד
 (The word) “to me” אֵלַי
 (from the posuk of) “the threshing floor” דְּהִגְרֹן
 (The word) “to me” אֵלַי
 (from the posuk of) “of barely” דְּהַשְׁעָרִים
 these are read and not written וְלֹא פְתִיבֹן⁴⁷

1. The posuk in Shmuel Bais (8:3) says [פְּרַת קָרִי וְלֹא כְתִיב] – that is, the posuk is read as if it was saying that Dovid Hamelech was stretching his hand over the river P’ras, even though the posuk does not say the word P’ras.
2. The posuk later on in Sefer Shmuel (ibid. 16:23) says [וְעֵצַת אַחֲתִיפָל אֲשֶׁר יַעַץ בְּיָמִים הֵהֶם כְּאֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאֵל אִישׁ קָרִי וְלֹא כְתִיב] דְּבָרְהָ אֱלֹקִים Achitofal asking in those days as a man that asks with regard to the word of Hashem. This is how the posuk is read even the word ‘man’ does not appear in the posuk.
3. The posuk in Sefer Yirmiyah (31:37) says [בָּאִים קָרִי וְלֹא כְתִיב] בָּאִים ‘הִנֵּה יָמִים הֵנֵּה יָמִים הָאֵלֶּיךָ יָבִיאוּ וְנִבְנְתָה הָעִיר לָהּ’. This posuk is read as “Behold days are coming said Hashem etc.”, even though the words ‘are coming’ do not appear in the posuk.
4. The posuk later on in Sefer Yirmiyah (ibid. 50:29) describes how the enemies of Bavel came to destroy the city and in midst of their battle cry they said [פְּלִיטָה לָהּ וְלֹא כְתִיב] אֵלֶיךָ לָהּ. This posuk is read as if it said, “And let there be no remains from her”, even though the words ‘from her’ are not written in the posuk.
5. The next posuk is the posuk in Megillas Rus (2:11) that describes how Boaz tells Rus that he had heard about everything that she had done for her mother-in-law. The posuk says [אֵת] בְּלִי אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ [אֵת] חֲמוּתְךָ. The Rishonim argue which ‘es’ the Gemara is referring to. The Rosh and Tosefos say that it is the first ‘es’ that is added, and the Ran says that it is the second ‘es’.
6. The next example is also from Megillas Rus (ibid. 3:5-6) when the posuk describes how Rus told her mother-in-law that she would do all that she had commanded her, and then Rus went to the threshing floor to do as her mother-in-law said. The pesukim there say [אֵלַי] אֲעֲשֶׂה: וְתָרַד. The pesukim are read as if Rus said, “I will do as you commanded to me etc.”, even though the words ‘to me’ are not written in the pesukim.
7. The last example is also from Megillas Rus (ibid. 17) when the posuk says [אֵלַי] אֵלַי תְּבוֹאִי יָרִיקִים אֵלַי חֲמוּתְךָ. This posuk is read as if it says “And she said ‘He gave me these six (measures) of barely, as he said to me ‘Do not come empty (handed) to your mother-in-law’ “. The posuk is read this way even though the words ‘to me’ to not appear in the posuk.

**Words of Tanach that Are Written in the Pesukim Even
Though they Are Not Read**

The Gemara now brings examples of words that are not read even though they are written in the pesukim. Once again, we will

only bring the examples in the translation, and we will save the explanations for the footnotes.

(And the example of words that are) written וכתבן

and are not read ולא קריין

(the word) 'please' נא

(from the posuk) of 'vaislach' ויטלח