



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua (cont.)

The Gemara answers that in Tohoros there are four times that the halacha follows R' Eliezer but in other sederim there are additional times that the halacha follows R' Eliezer.

This answer is proven correct.

The proof is successfully challenged and another proof is presented and clarified.

R' Elazar is also cited as stating that the halacha follows R' Eliezer in four cases.

R' Elazar's assertion that the halacha follow R' Eliezer in only four instances is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yirmiyah challenges R' Zeira's assertion that R' Eliezer is not the Tanna who holds that ketaf is considered fruit.

R' Zeira suggests two responses.

A proof to the second response is suggested but rejected.

R' Yochanan's assertion that Chachamim's opinion is that of R' Eliezer is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Besulah

A Baraisa elaborates on the Mishnah's definition of the term besulah.

The assertion of the Baraisa is challenged.

Four resolutions to the challenge are recorded.

Ravina's resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa that discusses besulah soil is recorded.

3) A pregnant woman

Sumchus in the name of R' Meir identifies the time at which a woman is considered pregnant.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. At what point is wine considered aged?

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Akiva and R' Elizer concerning havdala in tefilla?

3. What is קטף?

4. What is the suggestion that it takes three months for a fetus to become known?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Inserting havdalah into shmone esrei on motzei Shabbos מפני שצריך לומר הבדלה בחונן הדעת

On 7b, R' Yehuda said in the name of Shmuel that the halacha is according to R' Eliezer in four cases. On our daf (8a), R' Eliezer b. Pedas also ruled according to R' Eliezer in four cases. The Gemara presents other cases in which the halacha seems to be according to R' Eliezer, and it tries to explain why none of these cases was included in the original list of only four.

One of the cases presented which was not included in the original list is the Mishnah (Berachos 33a) where R' Akiva rules that on motzei Shabbos, havdalah is inserted as the fourth beracha of the shmoneh esrei, as a separate beracha. R' Eliezer disagrees and says that havdalah should be said in the beracha of Modim, and R' Eliezer b. Pedas rules according to R' Eliezer. Why is this ruling not included or added to the list of four cases where R' Eliezer b. Pedas rules according to R' Eliezer?

R' Abba answers that the view presented by R' Eliezer that havdalah should be recited in Modim was not only his view, but it was also the opinion of R' Chanina b. Gamliel. This is why R' Eliezer b. Pedas did not include this halacha in his list.

The Gemara cited a Baraisa in which R' Chanina b. Gamliel says that at the conclusion of Yom Kippur one may not daven an abridged form of the shmoneh esrei and recite the shortened beracha of Havineinu, because it is necessary to recite havdalah in the fourth beracha, in chonen hadaas.

Tosafos (8a) asks why the insertion of havdalah in the shmone esrei cannot be within the beracha of v'Havineinu itself. In fact, this very question is advanced against Shmuel (Berachos 29a), who is of the opinion that any person, even one who is not a traveler, may use the abridged version of the shmone esrei all year long, except for on motzei Shabbos because of the issue of reciting havdalah in the fourth beracha. When the Gemara suggests that perhaps havdalah could be inserted into v'Havineinu, the question remains unanswered. Our Gemara, as well, should at least present the possibility that havdalah be allowed to be said in v'Havineinu.

Tosafos answers that Shmuel, who allows v'Havineinu to be said all year long, apparently feels that this is a relatively standard form of shmone esrei, and the Gemara

(Continued on page 2)

HALACHAH Highlight

Making up a missed Yom Kippur Mincha

בנעילה מתפלל שבע ומתודה

In Ne'ilah we daven seven berachos and repent

In the course of the Gemara's discussion the topic of davening Ne'ilah is mentioned. Rav Shmuel Halevi Wosner¹ was asked about a person who was ill on Yom Kippur who went to sleep after Mussaf. He slept through Mincha but davened Ne'ilah together with the tzibbur. He wanted to know whether he should make up the missing Mincha when he davens Maariv or not. Rav Wosner responded that he is uncertain whether he should have to make up the missing tefilla. Ne'ilah is essentially the same as Mincha. The only substantive difference which is not essential is that Mincha does not include the section at the end of the tefilla that begins with the words **אתה הבדלת**. The fact that in Ne'ilah we say **חתמנו** rather than **כתבנו** is not enough of a difference to differentiate between the two. Accordingly, someone who was supposed to daven Mincha but accidentally davened Ne'ilah would be credited for davening Mincha since Mincha is the third tefilla of the day and Ne'ilah is the fourth tefilla. What emerges from this analysis is that this person is credited with Mincha and the tefilla that he is missing is Ne'ilah. Since Ne'ilah is not a tefilla that is recited every day there is no make up for missing it and he is not required to

(Insight...continued from page 1)

therefore feels that even on motzei Shabbos it should be appropriate to use this shortened form of shmone esrei and to insert havdalah into it. However, in our Gemara, R' Chanina holds that v'Havineinu should not be used for anyone, except for a traveler, or due to extenuating circumstances such as after a long fast when the community needs to be able to eat as soon as possible. When v'Havineinu is then considered, the Gemara understood that it is not appropriate to allow it, because of the need to incorporate havdalah in the beracha of chonen hada'as. ■

add an additional tefilla during Maariv. He writes, however, that the person should add a tefilla as a voluntary tefilla.

Someone² challenged Rav Wosner's assertion that one does not make up Ne'ilah from Pri Megadim's ruling that one who misses Ne'ilah should make up the missing tefilla. He answered that he disagreed and cited numerous sources including some Rishonim who rule that there is no make up for Ne'ilah. However³, he did retract his statement that one who davens Ne'ilah instead of Mincha is credited with davening Mincha since he discovered numerous Poskim who maintain that he is credited with Ne'ilah. Therefore, since it emerges that the tefilla that he missed was Mincha he could make that tefilla up at Maariv. ■

1. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ד סי' י"ג.
2. שם ח"ה סי' ס"ז.
3. שם ח"י סי' י"ז אות ה'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Focused Prayer

מתפלל שמונה עשרה

Today's daf discusses when v'Havineinu can be said, and when it cannot substitute for a complete shemonah esrei.

Interestingly, according to the strict letter of the law, one can even say v'Havineinu instead of the entire shemonah esrei if something is disturbing his ability to daven. The custom today is not to say v'Havineinu since one who does so may never daven a complete davening; he could potentially allow himself this liberty constantly since, in his own view, he is always too busy to

daven properly. Nevertheless, the primary halachah teaches us just how important it is to avoid disturbances and distractions during prayer.

When one man came late to shul, he was forced to pray right near the exit to shul. He davened a regular shemonah esrei, but others began finishing when he was not yet done. When he noticed that several people were waiting for him to finish before leaving he felt terrible.

He was exceedingly uncomfortable being their "wall" and could not focus on his prayers. He knew that at times it is permitted for one to move while in the middle of shemonah esrei but wondered if that was permitted in this instance.

When this question reached Rav Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv, zt"l, he an-

swered, "One who came late to shul and notices that people are waiting for him to finish so they can pass may sometimes move. If this disturbs him greatly he is permitted to move to a place where he will not disturb others and continue shemonah esrei from where he left off."¹ ■

1. שו"ת שערי יושר, ח"ב, סי' י"ח, ו'. ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The reason the pasuk cited is not a definitive proof is explained.

Another Baraisa related to a pregnant woman is cited.

The reason the pasuk cited is not a definitive proof is explained.

The Gemara challenges the Baraisa's assertion that carrying a non-fetus is considered a pregnancy. ■

