And Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel maintains: “In each and every year” teaches that just as each and every year Purim is celebrated in Adar that is adjacent to Nisan, so too here, in an intercalated year, Purim is celebrated during Adar that is adjacent to Nisan.

The Gemara asks: Granted, according to Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei, the reason for his opinion is logical, based on the principle that one does not forego performance of the mitzvot; rather, when presented with the opportunity to perform a mitzva, one should do so immediately. However, with regard to Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel, what is the reason for his opinion?

Rabbi Tavi said: The reason for the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel is that juxtaposing the celebration of one redemption, Purim, to the celebration of another redemption, Passover, is preferable.

Rabbi Elazar said: The reason for the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel is derived from here, as it is written: “To confirm this second letter of Purim” (Esther 9:29), indicating that there are circumstances where the Megilla is read a second time (Jerusalem Talmud), i.e., when the year was intercalated after the Megilla was read in the first Adar.

The Gemara comments: And it was necessary to write
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The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei, what does he do with this term: The second? Since he holds that the Megilla is read in the first Adar, what does he derive from the verse? The Gemara answers: He requires the term to derive that statement of Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda, as Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda said: Initially, they established the observance of Purim in the city of Shusht, alone, and ultimately they established it throughout the world, according to the second letter of Purim.

Apropos the statement of Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda with regard to the establishment of the holiday of Purim, the Gemara cites a related statement. Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda said: Esther sent to the Sages: Establish me for future generations.23 Esther requested that the observance of Purim and the reading of the Megilla be instituted as an ordinance for all generations. They sent to her: You will thereby arouse the wrath of the nations upon us, as the Megilla recounts the victory of the Jews over the gentiles, and it is best not to publicize that victory. She sent back to them: I am already written in the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia, and so the Megilla will not publicize anything that is not already known worldwide.
The second degree impurity would disqualify the sacred scrolls. The Sages issued a decree that sacred scrolls shall render hands impure, according hands that come into contact with a sacred scroll second degree ritual impurity status. This decree was issued to encourage greater regard for these scrolls by discouraging casual contact with them, as well as to discourage the practice of storing them in scrolls, affixing vellum which gnawed and ruined them. The second degree impurity would disinfect the scrolls and render their consumption prohibited. The Sages said in the mishna (Nedarim 4:6): The greater the significance of an item, the greater its impurity.

Esther was said with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit: A question is raised: From many of these sources, proof may be adduced that Mordecai was inspired by the Divine Spirit, as he was privy to matters he could not have otherwise known. However, these sources do not prove that the entire book of Esther was divinely inspired. Some answer that it would have been inappropriate to publicize the Divine Spirit in the book of Esther had the book itself not been divinely inspired (Yarav Devash).

The Gemara comments: This matter is parallel to a dispute between the tanna'im, as it was taught in a baraita: “Write this,” that which is written in the book of Exodus; “a memorial,” that which is written in Deuteronomy; “in the book,” that which is written in the Prophets; “in the book,” that which is written in the Megilla. The Megilla is the third mention of Amalek and not the fourth, as both mentions in the Torah pertaining to Amalek are considered one; therefore, Esther would be the third, not the fourth source.

Ray Yehuda said that Shmuel said: The book of Esther does not render the hands ritually impure. Although the Sages issued a decree that sacred scrolls render hands ritually impure, the book of Esther was not accorded the sanctity of sacred scrolls.

The Gemara asks: Is this to say that Shmuel maintains that the book of Esther was not stated with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit? But didn’t Shmuel himself say elsewhere that the book of Esther was stated with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit? The Gemara answers: It was stated with the Divine Spirit that it is to be read in public; however, it was not stated that it is to be written. Therefore, the text was not accorded the sanctity of sacred scrolls.

The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita. Rabbi Meir says: The book of Ecclesiastes does not render hands ritually impure, as it was not accorded the sanctity of sacred scrolls; however, there is a dispute with regard to whether or not the Song of Songs renders the hands impure. Rabbi Yosei says: The Song of Songs renders the hands ritually impure, but there is a dispute with regard to the book of Ecclesiastes. Rabbi Shimon says: The ruling with regard to Ecclesiastes is among the leniencies of Beit Shamai and among the stringencies of Beit Hillel, as according to Beit Hillel it renders the hands impure and according to Beit Shamai it does not. However, everyone agrees that the books of Ruth, and the Song of Songs, and Esther render the hands ritually impure, contrary to the opinion of Shmuel. The Gemara answers: It was Shmuel who stated his opinion in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua cited earlier that the book of Esther was not accorded the sanctity of sacred scrolls.
It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya says: The book of Ecclesiastes does not render the hands ritually impure because it is the wisdom of Solomon, and not divinely inspired. They said to him: It was certainly divinely inspired and that is the reason that the book of Ecclesiastes was added to the canon; as was it this alone that Solomon said! Wasn’t it already stated: “And he spoke three thousand proverbs, and his poems were a thousand and five” (1 Kings 5:12)? Solomon spoke many proverbs, but only a portion of them were canonized in the Bible. Apparently, what is unique about those in Ecclesiastes is that they were divinely inspired. And it says: “Add you not unto his words” (Proverbs 30:6).

The Gemara asks: What is added by the proof introduced with the phrase: And it says? Why wasn’t the first proof sufficient? The Gemara answers: And if you would say that in terms of what he said, he said a great deal, with regard to which, if he so desired, it was written, and if he so desired, it was not written; then that is why not all of his statements were preserved. Therefore, come and hear: Add you not unto his words. Apparently, the reason that it is prohibited to add to the proverbs is that the book of Ecclesiastes was divinely inspired.

It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: The book of Esther was said with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, as it is stated: “And Haman thought in his heart” (Esther 6:6). If the book of Esther was not divinely inspired, how was it known what Haman thought in his heart? Rabbi Akiva says: The book of Esther was said with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, as it is stated: “And Esther obtained favor in the sight of all those who looked upon her” (Esther 2:15); this could have been known only through divine inspiration.

Rabbi Meir says: The book of Esther was said with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, as it is stated with regard to the conspiracy of Bigtan and Teresh against Ahasuerus: “And the thing became known to Mordecai” (Esther 2:22). This too could have been known only through divine inspiration. Rabbi Yosei ben Durmaskit says: The book of Esther was said with the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, as it is stated: “But they did not lay their hands on the plunder” (Esther 9:15). The only way that could have been stated with certainty is through divine inspiration.

Shmuel said: Had I been there among the *tanna’im*, I would have stated a matter that is superior to them all, as it is stated: “They confirmed, and took upon themselves” (Esther 9:27), which was interpreted to mean: They confirmed above in heaven what they took upon themselves below on earth. Clearly, it is only through divine inspiration that this could have been ascertained.

Rava said: There is a refutation for all of these proofs, except for the proof cited by Shmuel, for which there is no refutation. The Gemara elaborates. That which Rabbi Eliezer said with regard to knowledge of what Haman was thinking in his heart can be refuted, as it is based on logical reasoning to conclude that this was his thinking. There was no other person as important to the king as he was; and the fact is that when he elaborated extensively and said: “Let the royal apparel be brought” (Esther 6:8), he said it with himself in mind.

That which Rabbi Akiva said with regard to the knowledge that Esther found favor in the eyes of all, perhaps it can be understood and refuted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, who said: This teaches that she appeared to each and every one as one of his nation, and they expressed that sentiment aloud.

And that which Rabbi Meir said, i.e., that the divine inspiration of the book of Esther is clear from the fact that Mordecai exposed the conspiracy against Ahasuerus, perhaps this can be explained and refuted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba, who said: Bigtan and Teresh were both members of the ‘Tarsi people’ and conversed in their own language. Mordecai, who was a member of the Sanhedrin and therefore fluent in many languages, understood what they were saying.
And that which Rabbi Yosei ben Durmaskit said with regard to the knowledge that no spoils were taken, perhaps this can be explained and refuted by the fact that they dispatched messengers who informed them of the situation. However, with regard to Shmuel’s proof from the fact that they confirmed above what they took upon themselves below, there is certainly no refutation. Ravina said: This explains the folk saying that people say: One sharp pepper is better than a basketful of pumpkins, as the quality of the pepper’s taste is more significant than the quantity of the pumpkins.

Rav Yosef said: Proof that the book of Esther was divinely inspired may be cited from here: “And these days of Purim shall not cease from among the Jews” (Esther 9:28), an assertion that could have been made only with divine inspiration. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak says: Proof may be cited from here, at the end of that verse: “Nor the memorial of them perish from their seed” (Esther 9:28).

The mishna mentions: And gifts distributed to the poor. Rav Yosef taught a baraita that the verse states: “And of sending portions one to another” (Esther 9:22), indicating two portions to one person.” The verse continues: “And gifts to the poor” (Esther 9:22), indicating two gifts to two people.

The Gemara relates that, on Purim, Rabbi Yehuda Nesisia sent to Rabbi Oshaya the leg of a third-born calf and a jug of wine. Rabbi Oshaya sent him a message of gratitude:

One sharp pepper is better – רמוך עד בצל עגבנון: It is explained in the Arukh that pepper, although it is small, is spicy and preferable to the relatively bland pumpkin. Likewise, although Shmuel was an amorar, whose standing is less significant than the tannaim who discussed this matter, his statement is more reasonable.

And these days of Purim – וְזִכְרָם לְרַבִּי. See Tosafot, who explain what Rav Nahman added to the source cited by Rav Yosef. Some explain that, from the first part of the verse cited by Rav Nahman, it can be determined only that the Jews took upon themselves to remember the days of Purim. Therefore, Rav Yosef cites the pronouncement in the second part of that verse: “Nor the memorial of them perish from their seed,” which was stated with divine inspiration.

Portions and gifts – מַתָּנוֹת וְגַרְבָּא: The early authorities wrote that the obligation to give two portions applies only if the recipient is a person of means, so that he will appreciate that it is a significant gift. However, one is required to give only one portion to a poor person, for whom even one portion is significant.
Yehuda Nesia sent a small gift, and Rabbi Oshaya responded:

"And sending portions one to another," and the mitzva of: "And gifts to the poor," as Rabbi Oshaya was poor and this was a substantial gift.

The Gemara relates that Rabbi sent Purim portions from the house of the Exilarch to Marei bar Mar in the hands of Abaye, who was his nephew and student. The Purim portions consisted of a sack [kaskha] full of dates [kashva] and a cupful of roasted flour [kimha de'arishuna].

Abaye said to him: Now, Mari will say the popular expression: Even if a farmer becomes the king, the basket does not descend from his neck. Rabbi was named the head of the yeshiva in Pumbedita, and nevertheless, he continued to send very plain gifts, because he was impoverished.

Marei bar Mar sent back to him a sack full of ginger and a cupful of long peppers [pilpalta arikha], a much more expensive gift. Abaye said to him: The master, Rabbi, will now say: I sent him sweet items and he sent me pungent ones.

In describing that same incident, Abaye said: When I left the house of the master, Rabbi, to go to Marei bar Mar, I was already satiated. However, when I arrived there at Marei bar Mar’s house, they served me sixty plates of sixty kinds of cooked dishes, and I ate sixty portions from each of them. The last dish was called pot roast, and I was still so hungry that I wanted to chew the plate afterward.

And in continuation Abaye said: This explains the folk saying that people say: The poor man is hungry and does not know it, as Abaye was unaware how hungry he had been in his master’s house. Alternatively, there is another appropriate popular expression: Room in the stomach for sweats can always be found.

The Gemara relates that Abaye bar Avin and Rabbi Hanina bar Avin would exchange their meals with each other to fulfill their obligation of sending portions on Purim.

Rava said: A person is obligated to become intoxicated with wine on Purim until he is so intoxicated that he does not know how to distinguish between cursed is Haman and blessed is Mordecai.
Rava said: A Purim feast that one ate at night did not fulfill his obligation. What is the reason? “Days of fasting and gladness” (Esther 9:22) is written, i.e., days and not nights. The Gemara relates: Rav Ashi was sitting before Rav Kahana his teacher on Purim, and it grew dark and the Sages who usually came to study with him did not come. Rav Ashi said to him: What is the reason that the Sages did not come today? Rav Kahana answered: Perhaps they are preoccupied with the Purim feast. Rav Ashi said to him: Wasn’t it possible for them to eat the feast at night on Purim, instead of being derelict in their Torah study on Purim day? Rav Kahana said to him: Didn’t the master learn that which Rava said: A Purim feast that one ate at night did not fulfill his obligation? Rav Ashi said to him: Did Rava say that? Rav Kahana said to him: Yes. Rav Ashi then learned it from him forty times until he remembered it so well that it seemed to him as if it were placed in his purse.

The Gemara infers that with regard to the matter of actions that facilitate preparation of food, e.g., sharpening a knife for slaughter, this, Shabbat, and that, Festivals, are equal, in that actions that facilitate preparation of food are prohibited.

The Gemara comments: If so, the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it is taught in a baraita: The difference between Festivals and Shabbat is only in preparing food. Rabbi Yehuda permits even actions that facilitate preparation of food on Festivals.

The Gemara elaborates. What is the reason for the opinion of the first tanna? It is as the verse states: “Except that which every person must eat, only that may be done for you” (Exodus 12:16). “That” is permitted, and not actions that facilitate it. And Rabbi Yehuda says: “For you” means for you, for all your needs.

HALAKHA

Purim feast – שֶׁמֶרֶדֶת פּוּרִים. The Purim feast must be eaten on the day of Purim. In accordance with the opinion of Rava, if one eats it at night, he did not fulfill his obligation. The custom is to eat the Purim feast after the afternoon prayer; however, it is appropriate that most of the feast be eaten before nighttime. If Purim occurs on Friday, one eats the Purim feast in the morning.

Some hold that the feast should always be before the afternoon prayer (Shenei Luhot HaBent; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 659:1).

The difference between the Festivals and Shabbat is only, etc. – אֲמַרְתָּךְ וֵאֶנְפָפָךְ אֶלָּא וְאַשִּּׁי. All labor prohibited on Shabbat is prohibited on Festivals, except for labor performed in the preparation of food. Likewise, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda in tractate Beitza, it is permitted to perform labor that facilitates the preparation of food, provided that it was not possible to attend to it prior to the Festival. Some prohibit even the preparation of food itself if the taste of the food is not diminished by preparation prior to the Festival (Elyia Rabbah; Pen Hadas, and this is the custom. Nevertheless, if for some reason one failed to perform the labor prior to the Festival and he needs the food on the Festival, the labor is permitted but must be performed in a different manner than it is typically performed (Roma). If he failed to prepare the food before the Festival due to circumstances beyond his control, he may prepare the food on the Festival in the typical manner (Shulhan Arukh HaRav; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim 495:3).
The Gemara asks: And for the other, first, tanna too, isn’t it written: “For you”? The Gemara answers: He infers: For you, and not for gentiles; for you, and not for dogs. It is forbidden to perform labors for the sake of gentiles, or for animals, even if it is to feed them.

The Gemara asks further: And for the other tanna, Rabbi Yehuda, too, isn’t it written: “That,” which is a restrictive term that limits the application of a particular halakha? The Gemara answers: It is written: “That,” which is restrictive, and it is written: “For you,” which is inclusive. Rabbi Yehuda resolves the conflict between the two: Here, the word: “That,” is referring to actions that facilitate, in which it is possible to perform them on the Festival eve but which are prohibited on the Festival; there, the phrase: “For you,” is referring to actions that facilitate, in which it is impossible to perform them on the Festival and which are permitted even on the Festival.

MISHNA The difference between Shabbat and Yom Kippur with regard to the labor prohibited on those days is only that in this case, i.e., Shabbat, its intentional desecration is punishable at the hand of Man, as he is stoned by a court based on the testimony of witnesses who forewarned the transgressor; and in that case, i.e., Yom Kippur, its intentional desecration is punishable at the hand of God, with karet.26

GEMARA The Gemara infers that with regard to the matter of payment of damages, both this, Shabbat, and that, Yom Kippur, are equal in that one is exempt in both cases. If one performs an action on Shabbat that entails both a prohibited labor and damage to another’s property, since his transgression is punishable by death, he is exempt from paying damages. Apparently, according to the misha, the same halakha applies to Yom Kippur.

The Gemara asks: According to whose opinion is the misha taught? The Gemara answers: It is according to the opinion of Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana, as it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana would render Yom Kippur like Shabbat with regard to payment of damages. Just as in the case of one who intentionally desecrates Shabbat he is liable to receive the death penalty4 and is therefore exempt from the obligation of payment of damages caused while desecrating Shabbat, so too, in the case of one who intentionally desecrates Yom Kippur, he is liable to receive the death penalty and is therefore exempt from the obligation of payment of damages caused while desecrating Yom Kippur.

We learned there in a misha (Makkot 33a): All those liable to receive karet who were flogged in court were exempted from their karet, which is imposed by heaven. Most transgressors are liable to receive karet for violating prohibitions that are punishable by flogging. If they are flogged, they are exempt from karet, as it is stated with regard to one liable to receive lashes: “Then your brother shall be dishonored before you” (Deuteronomy 25:3), indicating that once he was flogged he is like your brother, and his sins have been pardoned; this is the statement of Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel. Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel’s colleagues disagree with him on this issue.

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana – This rabbi, Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana was a tanna during the generation when the Second Temple was destroyed. It is possible that he is the same tanna occasionally referred to as Rabbi Nehunya the Great. Apparently, he had a close relationship with the students of Rabbi Yishmael ben Zakka.

Few of Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana’s halakhic statements were preserved; however, several aggadic statements are cited in his name. The prayer that he recited upon entering the study hall (berakhot 28b) is widely known. Later in this tractate (28a) his positive attributes and his modesty are recounted. Rabbi Nehunya is credited with development of the hermeneutical method of generalization and detail, and it is generally attributed to Rabbi Yishmael, his most prominent student. Authorship of Sefer ḤaBahir, a kabbalistic mishnah, is also attributed to him, as is the prayer: Please, with the might (ana bekholat), Kana is the name of a city in the tribal territory of Asher (Joshua 19:28). Perhaps his title is attributable to the place where he lived.

NOTES

Is liable to receive the death penalty – As a rule, one is not liable to receive two punishments for two transgressions violated simultaneously. The principle is: One is liable to receive the greater punishment. There is an additional principle that in the case of a prohibition punishable by death, even if the punishment is not implemented due to lack of testimony or forewarning, the mere fact that the prohibition is associated with the stringent punishment exempts one who violated it from any lesser punishment.

The dispute here is with regard to karet. Because it is not a punishment administered by the court, perhaps these principles do not apply.

HALAKHA

For you and not for gentiles, for you and not for dogs – It is prohibited to perform labor on Festivals, even labor performed in the preparation of food, for the benefit of a gentile. One may not perform labor on a Festival to prepare food for an animal (Shulḥan Arukh, Ḥorah 321:3).

Shabbat and Yom Kippur – It is prohibited to perform labor on Yom Kippur. All actions prohibited by rabbinic law on Shabbat are similarly prohibited on Yom Kippur, although one who performs them is exempt from punishment. There is an additional difference between labor performed on Shabbat and labor performed on Yom Kippur with regard to damage caused to the property of another while performing a prohibited labor; e.g., burning another’s field. On Yom Kippur, he is obligated to pay for the damage; and on Shabbat, he is exempt, as the halakha is ruled contrary to the opinion of Rabbi Nehunya ben HaKana, who rules that he is exempt from payment on Yom Kippur as well (Magen Avraham, Ḥorah 611:2).

Those liable to receive karet who were flogged – All who violated prohibitions and were flogged are rehabilitated. Similarly, one who is liable to receive karet and was flogged is exempt from the punishment of karet, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hananya ben Gamliel (Rambam Sefer Shoftim, Hilkhah Sanhedrin 17:7).

BACKGROUND

Karet – Karet is a divine punishment administered for serious transgressions. The commentaries dispute its precise parameters. Among the characteristics of karet are: Premature or sudden death, no children or death of one’s children, exclusion of the soul from the World-to-Come. In tractate Karetot, thirty-six transgressions punishable by karet are enumerated. All are prohibitions, with the exception of two: Failure to sacrifice the Paschal lamb and failure to perform circumcision. Karet is administered only to one who commits a transgression intentionally. In many cases, if the transgression was committed in the presence of witnesses, the transgressor is subject to execution administered by the court, or to lashes. Anyone who violates one of the prohibitions punishable by karet unwittingly is liable to bring a sin-offering as atonement.
And why was karet administered to one’s sister excluded – סכינו שנייה? The principle here is: A matter that was included in a generalization but was explicitly excluded in order to teach a halakha, was not excluded to teach only concerning the specific matter at hand; it was rather excluded in order to teach concerning an entire generalization. In other words, an exception written with regard to one detail applies to the entire generalization. See Tosafot, who explain this slightly differently.

Rava said that the Sages of the school of Rav said: We learned: The difference between Yom Kippur and Shabbat is only that in this case, Shabbat, its intentional desecration is punishable at the hand of Man; and in that case, Yom Kippur, its intentional desecration is punishable with karet. And if the statement of Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel is so, in both this case, Shabbat, and that case, Yom Kippur, the punishment is at the hand of Man.

Rav Nahman said: There is no proof from here that Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel’s colleagues disagree with him, as in accordance with whose opinion is this mishna taught? It is according to the opinion of Rabbi Yitzhak, who said: There are no lashes in cases of those liable to receive karet, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yitzhak says: All those liable to receive karet in cases of incest were included in the principle: “For whoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the persons that commit them shall be cut off from among their people” (Leviticus 18:29).

And why was karet administered to one’s sister excluded from this verse and mentioned independently (Leviticus 20:17)? It is to sentence her to the punishment of karet and not to the punishment of lashes. This serves as a paradigm; wherever one is liable to receive karet, there are no lashes.

Rav Ashi said: Even if you say that the mishna is according to the opinion of the Rabbs who disagree with Rabbi Yitzhak and hold that there are lashes even in cases where there is liability for karet, there is no proof that Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel’s colleagues disagree with him. The mishna can be understood as follows: In this case, Shabbat, the primary punishment for its intentional desecration is at the hand of Man; and in that case, Yom Kippur, the primary punishment for its intentional desecration is with karet. If, however, he was flogged, he is exempt from karet.

Utensils that one uses in preparation of food – כלי שעושה. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that there is a distinction to be made between utensils in which food is prepared, e.g., a sieve and a sifter, which would be prohibited to one who is prohibited by vow from deriving benefit from another’s food; and vessels in which food is merely placed, e.g., cups and plates, which are permitted even to that person.

NOTES

MISHNA The difference between one for whom benefit from another is forbidden by vow and one for whom benefit from another’s food is forbidden by vow is only with regard to stepping foot on his property, and with regard to borrowing utensils from him that one does not use in the preparation of food, but for other purposes; as those two benefits are prohibited to the former, but permitted to the latter.

GEMARA The Gemara infers that with regard to the matter of utensils that one uses in preparation of food, both this, one who vowed that any benefit is forbidden, and that, one who vowed that benefit from food is forbidden, are equal. It is prohibited for both to derive benefit from utensils used in the preparation of food.

HALAKHA One prohibited by vow from deriving benefit from another and one prohibited by vow from deriving benefit from another’s food – בaned מרשמהא לת FixedUpdate לשון, בקבר היה ויקרים: One for whom it is prohibited to derive benefit from another’s possessions is prohibited to pass through his friend’s property, even if it does not shorten his path (Taz; Shaked). He may not even go through his friend’s fields during the summer, when people typically overlook trespassing in their fields. Likewise, he may not borrow any vessel from his friend. If he is prohibited by vow from deriving benefit from another’s food, it is prohibited to eat his food. If one said: Benefit from your food is prohibited for me, he may not eat the food; however, he may use vessels used in preparation of the food. If he said: Benefit that leads to food is prohibited for me, he may neither eat the food nor benefit from any vessel that is typically rented (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 221:1).