

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a list of people who are exempt from the mitzvah of appearing in the Beis Hamikdash for Yom Tov. Two disputes between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel are presented, the first concerns the age of a child who is exempt from appearing in the Beis Hamikdash and the second relates to the minimum value of the animal to be used for the Olas Re'iyah and Shalmei Chagigah.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara inquires what case is included by the Mishnah's use of the term "הכל."

After two failed attempts at answering the inquiry, the Gemara determines that it includes one who is blind in one eye.

The Gemara reintroduces one of the rejected answers and offers a resolution to the earlier challenge against it.

3) חרש

It is asserted that the חרש mentioned in our Mishnah refers to a person who is both deaf and mute, which is the standard definition of this term.

It is noted that this explanation of the Mishnah supports a statement recorded in a Baraisa.

The sources for terms חרש and אלם are identified.

A contradiction between a Mishnah and a Baraisa is noted concerning the obligation of one who can only speak or only hear to appear in the Beis Hamikdash.

Ravina or Rava resolve the inquiry by adding a missing phrase to the Mishnah.

A Baraisa supports this reading of the Mishnah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. When is a child obligated in the mitzvah of ראייה?

2. How does Hashem "see"?

3. What is the standard definition of a חרש?

4. What is the mitzvah of שמחה?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The offerings brought when celebrating the festivals

הכל חייבים בראיה

Our Massechta deals with the various offerings brought as one arrives on his pilgrimage to Yerushalayim for the festival. The olah is discussed in the first Mishnah, and a Chagiga offering, as well as a simcha offering, is discussed later.

Rambam rules (Hilchos Yom Tov 6:18) that in order to fulfill the mitzvah of simcha on Yom Tov a man should eat meat and drink wine. Beis Yosef (O.C. 529) questions Rambam from the information in the Baraisa (Pesachim 109a) which seems to say that in our days when we no longer have the Beis HaMikdash simcha is only achieved with the drinking of wine and there is no need for meat. Beitzta (Beitza 2:5) explains that when the Baraisa says that in our days simcha is fulfilled with wine it does not mean to exclude meat from the menu. Rather, it means that if we would have a Beis HaMikdash it would be adequate to partake of the meat from the Shelamim offering and one's simcha would be complete. In our days, however, it is not enough to eat meat, which is still a source of simcha, but it must be supplemented with wine as well.

R' Yoel Sirkis, the Bach, uses a different approach to explain Rambam. Certainly the main source of one's Simchas Yom Tov is to have the meal of a shelamim. Yet this simcha is composed of two elements. One aspect of the simcha is bringing an offering to Hashem while the other is the eating of meat. Drinking wine, however, has within it the one component featured in the verse (Tehillim 104:15) "Wine gladdens the heart of man." When there is no Beis HaMikdash the wine remains a true source of simcha while the meat is not a main source of simcha (without being from a korban). The Baraisa therefore acknowledges both meat and wine as sources of simcha and this is the ruling of Rambam.

Sefer Chofetz Chaim sidesteps the issue altogether as he understands that Rambam did not mean that both meat and wine would ever provide simcha under the same conditions. Instead, he explains that Rambam means that simcha can be achieved in different times and manners. During the time of the Beis HaMikdash meat was most effective. Nowadays simcha is attained via wine.

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated by the family of
מרת חנה בת ר' דוד, ע"ה רובין
Mrs. Ann Ruben o.b.m.

HALACHAH Highlight

Are mothers obligated in the mitzvah of chinuch?

ובית הלל אומרים כל שאינו יכול לאחוז בידו של אביו ולעלות מירושלים להר הבית

Beis Hillel says that [the definition of a child that is exempt from the mitzvah of *re'ayah*] is one who cannot hold his father's hand and ascend from Yerushalayim to Har Habayis.

Rabbeinu Yisroel Isserlin¹, the Terumas Hadeshen, was asked whether a child who did not have a father was obligated to eat and sleep in the sukkah. The thrust of the question was whether a mother is obligated in the chinuch – education in mitzvos—of her son. Terumas Hadeshen begins his analysis of this issue by citing the opinion of one of the Ba'alei Tosafos² who maintains that only fathers are obligated to teach their children how to perform mitzvos. He then proceeds to cite the opinion of Rabbeinu Eliezer of Metz³ who seemingly maintains that the mitzvah of chinuch is not limited to the father and even the child's mother is obligated to train her sons to perform mitzvos.

Rav Avrohom Gombiner⁴, the Magen Avrohom, rules in accordance with the position that limits the mitzvah of chinuch to the father. The basis of his position is the Gemara in Nazir⁵ which states, according to Reish Lakish, that

the mitzvah of chinuch is incumbent only on the father. Rav Chaim Yosef Dovid Azulai⁶, the Gaon Chida, also writes that although Terumas Hadeshen was uncertain about which position to follow, the majority of Rishonim hold that the mitzvah of chinuch is limited to the father; therefore that is the opinion to follow.

Chikrei Lev⁷ initially cites Rashi's comment to the Mishnah as support for the position that mothers are obligated in the mitzvah of chinuch. Rashi⁸ writes that although a child that is old enough to hold his father's hand is not Biblically obligated in the mitzvah of re'ayah, nevertheless the Chachamim imposed an obligation on his father and mother to train him in mitzvos. This would seemingly align Rashi with those who maintain that mothers are obligated in the mitzvah of chinuch. Chikrei Lev, however, refutes this proof and offers alternative interpretations of Rashi's comment that do not indicate conclusively that Rashi obligates women in the mitzvah of chinuch. ■

1. שו"ת תרומת הדשן סי' צ"ד.
2. תוס' ישנים ליומא פד. ד"ה בן.
3. הובא דבריו בתוס' ישנים הנ"ל.
4. מג"א סי' שמ"ג סק"א.
5. גמ' נזיר כט.
6. ברכי יוסף אר"ח סי' שמ"ג סק"ז.
7. חקרי לב אר"ח סי' עי.
8. רש"י ד"ה אי זהו. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Master Must Pay

"כופין את רבו ועושה אותו בן חורין..."

There lived in Gur a certain man who literally could not make ends meet. Today this means someone who can't pay his bills, but over a hundred years ago in the "old country" it meant someone who couldn't get enough food to feed his family. This person who lived in Gur didn't have enough money for food, and he certainly didn't have enough to pay his landlord for the little room he shared with his family. The landlord was furious and warned his tenant that if he didn't pay up soon he would evict him. The poor man ran to the Chiddushei HaRim, zt"l, and tearfully told him about his landlord's ulti-

matum. The Rav quickly summoned the homeowner.

In those days, a person who defied the Rav could be placed in cherem. This often meant that his fellow Jews wouldn't associate with him until he repented his sin. When Jewish communities were still so tightly knit, being made an outcast was unthinkable.

When the wealthy man appeared before the Chiddushei HaRim, he said, "Do not evict your tenant even though he hasn't paid his rent. You can afford to wait, but he has got no money for food!"

"But Rebbe," pleaded the homeowner, "why should I have to support this man in my house and defer his rent until he will be able to pay? Everyone knows he is unlikely to become solvent. Why shouldn't the whole

community have to shoulder the burden of this man's rent? If the Rebbe would only say the word, people would surely be willing to cover his costs!"

"Actually, we see from the Gemara in Chagigah 2b that the burden is yours," answered the Rav.

"In Chagigah 2b we find that one who is partial owner of a slave who has already bought half of his freedom must free his half-slave, who will write a promissory note to his master for the loss. Why doesn't it say that we pay the owner with charity funds instead of forcing the owner to accept a potentially worthless promissory note? We see from this that Hashem wants the master to wait, and not that his burden should be borne by the community! You have been sent this man from heaven, so his burden is on you!" ■

