

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The dispute between R' Akiva and Ben Nanas (cont.)

R' Yochanan identifies a case where R' Akiva and Ben Nanas agree.

2) The two loaves and accompanying lambs

Ulla reports that in Eretz Yisroel they asked whether the waving of the loaves and the lambs creates an attachment.

After clarifying the inquiry the Gemara leaves the matter unresolved.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenged the possibility that waving the loaves and lambs creates a connection between them.

R' Yochanan's ruling that slaughtering creates a connection between the loaves and the lambs is unsuccessfully challenged from a Baraisa.

R' Yirmiyah asks another inquiry related to the connection between the loaves and the lambs and this inquiry is also left unresolved.

Rava explains to Abaye why the loaves are connected to lambs more than the other animals that are offered in conjunction with the two loaves.

This explanation is challenged and revised a couple of times until the Gemara accepts the resolution.

3) Offering the loaves alone

A Baraisa describes what is done when the loaves are offered without lambs.

Rabbah explains the rationale of the Baraisa and provides a source for his explanation.

Abaye rejects Rabbah's proof and offers another explanation of the Baraisa.

R' Yosef offers his own explanation of the Baraisa.

Abaye successfully challenges this explanation and R'

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

The two loaves of Shavuot which are offered without the sheep

לפי שאין שורפין קדשים ביום טוב

According to R' Akiva in the Mishnah (45b), the bringing of the offering of the two sheep is not critical in order for the offering of the two loaves of Shavuot to be allowed. A Baraisa taught the halacha regarding eating these two loaves which were brought by themselves, without being accompanied by the two sheep. The Baraisa rules that the two loaves should be waved, and then left overnight until their appearance deteriorates (עיבור צורה), at which point the loaves may be destroyed by fire. The Gemara inquires about this halacha, because if the offering of the loaves is acceptable, why are they not eaten? And if they are not valid, why do they have to be left overnight before being destroyed?

Rabba answers that the loaves are permitted, but we do not allow them to be eaten because of a rabbinic enactment. In the future, people might remember that we allowed the two loaves to be eaten without offering the two sheep, and they might again eat the loaves next year without offering the two sheep. Their mistake would be that the previous year this was permitted because if there are no sheep to be brought, the loaves are kosher without the sheep. However, in subsequent years when the offering of the sheep will take place, the loaves may not be eaten until the sheep are brought. Therefore, we do not allow the loaves to be eaten even when they are brought by themselves.

Rav Yosef offers a different explanation why the loaves are destroyed and not eaten. Because these loaves were brought without the sheep that should have accompanied them, they may not be eaten, and they may technically be burned and destroyed immediately. However, we are aware that two sheep might later be found which can still be brought on Yom Tov. According to Rashi, these sheep have the ability to permit the loaves to be eaten, so burning the loaves prematurely would be a mistake. Only once Yom Tov is over, and we realize that there were no sheep to be had, are the loaves to be burned.

Chidushei HaGri"z notes that according to Rabba who holds that the loaves may be eaten, even if two sheep are later found, the status of the loaves remains permitted, and there is no need to re-wave the loaves with the sheep in order to permit them. Gri"z wonders, though, that according to Rav Yosef the loaves had already been waived without the sheep,

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between Ben Nanas and R' Akiva?

2. How do we know that a Todah may be offered without loaves?

3. At what point do the loaves of a Nazir's korban become sanctified?

4. What is "Rabbah's concern"?

HALACHAH Highlight

A child donating a half-shekel to the Beis HaMikdash

אלא שהכהנים דורשין מקרא זה לעצמן

But the kohanim exposit this pasuk for their own benefit

Rambam¹ writes that a minor is exempt from the mitzvah of donating a half-shekel to the Beis HaMikdash used to fund korbanos. He further explains that a minor is any child below the age of thirteen. Nevertheless, if a child wishes to donate a half-shekel the donation is accepted. Sha'ar Hamelech² is troubled by this ruling. The only way a voluntary donation could be accepted is if it is donated wholeheartedly because if it is not given wholeheartedly it would turn out that a communal korban would be brought from private rather than communal funds. How is it possible for a child to donate a half-shekel wholeheartedly when Biblically children do not have the capacity to convey ownership? Accordingly, if a child donates a half-shekel it could not be used for a communal korban since Biblically he retains ownership of that money. Sha'ar Hamelech answers that Biblically the child's coin becomes nullified amongst the numerous coins donated by the adults. It is only rabbinically that coins are considered significant and are not nullified but since rabbinically a minor can convey ownership his donation may be accepted.

Minchas Chinuch³ challenges this explanation from the Gemara in Beitzah (38b) that teaches that a person's money does not become nullified amongst other funds, meaning that the owner never loses his ownership. Sefer Kinyan Torah B'Hala-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

and this determined that they be burned. How, then, can our finding sheep change the status of the loaves and allow them to be eaten?

Gri"z explains that R' Yosef holds that the main objective of bringing the loaves, even when they are brought by themselves, is in order to eat them. As long as we have no sheep, there is no manner to permit the loaves, so they must be burned and destroyed. If we do find sheep, we are not changing anything when we permit the loaves to be eaten. ■

cha⁴ answers based on a principle established by Tzelach that the principle that certain items are not nullified even at a ratio of 1000:1 applies only to the mixture. However, if units are removed from that mixture it may be assumed that they come from the majority and are usable. Consequently, although the child's money does not become nullified, whenever money is removed from the collection of half-shekels it is assumed that it is an adult's coin. Proof to this is found in our Gemara. R' Yochanan ben Zakai asserts that Kohanim generated an exposition for their own benefit to exempt themselves from giving the half-shekel. The reason their claim that they cannot donate is ignored is that they represent a minority of the population and there is no reason to think that a kohen's money will be used for the communal Menachos. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"א מהל' שקלים ה"ז.

2. שער המלך שם ה"א.

3. מנחת חינוך מצוה ק"ה.

4. ספר קנין תורה בהלכה או"ח סי' פ"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Woman's obligation to daven Musaf

"העיד בן בוכרי כל כהן ששוקל..."

A certain woman wondered whether she was obligated to make time to daven musaf. Although musaf is obviously a mitzvas aseil shehazeman gramah from which women are generally exempt, so is tefilah, yet they are obligated.

When this question was brought before the author of the B'samim Rosh, zt"l, he ruled that women are not required to say musaf. "It is clear that a woman is not obligated to daven musaf since this prayer corresponds to the korban musaf. It follows that only one who was obligated to give machatzit hashekel which paid for the korbanos

tzibbur must daven musaf to replace the korban he would have paid to bring. A woman who was not obligated to give shekalim is not required by the letter of the law. Nevertheless, the custom today is for all women to daven musaf since they are careful to daven everything and they have therefore obligated themselves in this."¹

When Rabbi Akiva Eiger, zt"l, was asked this same question he brought the words of the B'Samim Rosh and concurred with his conclusion, "Presumably women are not halachically obligated to daven musaf."²

Yet when this question reached Rav Yitzchak Elchonon Specter, zt"l, he ruled that women were definitely obligated to daven musaf. "In Menachos 46 we find that according to some the kohanim were not obligated to give shekalim;

would any say that a kohen need not daven musaf? How about a young man under-twenty who is not obligated to give shekalim; is every male absolved from davening mussf for the first seven years after his bar mitzvah? And how are women to attain the atonement the korban musaf afforded if it is not brought for them and they need not say it? Therefore it is clear that women are required to say musaf."³ ■

1. שו"ת בשמים ראש, סי' פ"ט

2. שו"ת ר' עקיבא איגר, סי' ט'

3. שו"ת בית יצחק, או"ח, סי' י"ז, אות ב'

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Yosef revises his explanation.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this explanation.

Rava explains the Baraisa consistent with Rabbah's explanation and provides a source for his explanation. ■