



לע"נ ברוך בענדיט וברכה גרוס ע"ה
by Mr. & Mrs. Duvy Gross

לע"נ אסתר אביגיל בת חיה רבקה וציפורה רחל בת אסתר מחלה THE DIMONT FAMILY EDITION

THE DAF **שבת** MATTERS

שבת קודש פרשת פנחס | מסכת יבמות דף קי"ד

IYUN ON THE DAF

By Rabbi Yitzchok Gutterman

The Gemara brings the מחלוקת about whether אוכל נבילות קטן, whether a child is not מצווין ב"ד מצווין or not. There is a מחלוקת אחרונים as to how to explain this מחלוקת. The קובץ הערות explains that it is clear from the גמרא earlier on דף ל"ג that a child is not מצווה in any מצוה at all in a personal sense since the גמרא there says that an example of 2 איסורים being חל at the same second is a case where a child got 2 שערות on שבת where the איסור זרות and שבת are חל at the same time. So it is clear that no איסור exists in childhood. Yet the גמרא says in סנהדרין that when a child sins on purpose it is considered a "תקלה". He explains that although there is no actual איסור for a child, there is still the איסור סיבת which exists. Consequently, the מ"ד who holds להפרישו exists it is enough for us to have to stop the child. The one who holds מצווין להפרישו אין ב"ד מצווין holds there is no need to prevent a child from doing something when there is no actual איסור on the child. He also explains based on this the following: according to the שיטות mentioned above (number 1) that there is no איסור to feed a child non-kosher food other than דם and שרצים, how is a child allowed to be שוחט an animal and a גוי isn't? They can both eat the animal without שחיטה! He answers that even though the איסור itself doesn't exist for the child on a personal level, the סיבת האיסור is still there for the child while it isn't there for the גוי. The גוי disagrees and says the מחלוקת is whether there is any concept of איסור at all by a child. If you hold בית דין must stop a child from eating treif then you hold there is an actual איסור for the child but the child is simply an אונס so Hashem doesn't punish them. If you hold you don't need to stop him then that means there is no issue whatsoever (not even a איסור). The אורה agrees with this and explains that the גמרא earlier that said both איסורים come at the same time is going like the one who holds להפרישו מצווין, but if you held להפרישו אין ב"ד מצווין then we would not view it as if the איסור suddenly came at bar mitzvah age but rather existed when he was a child as well.

STORIES OFF THE DAF "To exhort the great ones"

ת"ש אמור ואמרת להזהיר גדולים על הקטנים

The Beis Yisroel, ז"ל, was well known for doing a tremendous amount of קירוב with the broken and shattered souls who had been through the horrors of the Holocaust. Despite his characteristic sharpness to those who he felt needed to be galvanized to greater heights, he was exceedingly gentle and loving with those who needed encouragement. He brought very many confused survivors back to Torah and mitzvos. Once, the Beis Yisroel, ז"ל, met with another Rebbe. As the two spoke in learning, this other Admor delivered some mussar to the Beis Yisroel. "Rashi in Parshas Emor brings the Gemara in Yevamos 114a that says: 'It says Emor...v'amarta before the prohibition against kohanim willfully becoming ritually impure so as to warn adults about minors (forbidding adult kohanim to defile minors).' The verse concludes אל שפנל וימעב אמטי אל שפנל (עונמות). Thus the verse metaphorically teaches that those of greater stature should be careful when working to bring distant people closer to Hashem (קירוב) that they not be burned by the burning coals of these people. These coals are the negative connections to low spiritual places and philosophies such people invariably have. One must work hard to ensure one does not fall spiritually when working with such people!"

"Incorrect! The משמעות is the opposite!" fired back the Beis Yisroel, "Those of greater stature are obligated to help those of smaller stature to sanctify and purify themselves. Hashem promises that those who do so לשם שמים will not be defiled by these people's burning coals, the impurity from which they have yet to be cleansed! The reason why is obvious. In the merit of those of greater stature who descend to help those of smaller stature and bring them closer, Hashem protects them from being negatively influenced by those whom they help. This is the deeper meaning of the Mishnah in Avos that states מתלמידי יותר מכולם. 'I learned most from my students.'

One who has helped others come close is not dragged down at all. Quite the contrary! They are enabled to ascend even higher than they were before!"

PARSHA CONNECTION

Our Parsha begins with a promise made to פנחס of "בריתי שלום", our משנה also describes the environment in which a couple were living before they traveled overseas as שלום. We understand the meaning of שלום between a husband and wife, but what does it mean for פנחס? The ספורנו explains that it refers to שלום with the המות, מלאך המות, meaning that פנחס would live on in peace and free of מיתה. The reason given for this reward is פנחס's saving ישראל from destruction by killing זמרי. We find that משה רבינו similarly saved ישראל from the העגל, yet he was not rewarded with eternal peace, why? When looking at the verse in this week's פרשה it says אהרן הכהן בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן "פינחס בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן ולא כליתי את בני ישראל". The reason given for this reward is פנחס's saving ישראל from destruction by killing זמרי. We find that משה רבינו similarly saved ישראל from the העגל, yet he was not rewarded with eternal peace, why? When looking at the verse in this week's פרשה it says אהרן הכהן בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן "פינחס בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן ולא כליתי את בני ישראל". What does it mean to save from on top of ישראל and already happening. On the other hand, משה רבינו prevented the מגיפה from starting.

HALACHA HIGHLIGHT

Feeding Children on Yom Kippur

לא תאכילום להזהיר הגדולים על הקטנים

"Do not feed them" constitutes a warning against adults feeding children etc.

Rabbeinu Moshe of Pontaiza asked Rabbeinu Tam¹ for his opinion regarding the practice of pious people who refrain from feeding their children on Yom Kippur, even those who have not yet reached the age of chinuch. Furthermore, those who follow this practice criticize those who are not strict by claiming that they are in violation of the prohibition mentioned in our Gemara that one is not permitted to hand a child something that is prohibited. Rabbeinu Nissim², the Ran, asks a similar question against Rambam. Rambam rules that the five restrictions are Biblically prohibited and yet it is evident from the Gemara that it is permitted for an adult to bathe a child on Yom Kippur. Why doesn't that practice violate the prohibition against handing a child something that is prohibited?

Rav Shlomo Kluger³ suggests, as a resolution to Ran's question, that the prohibition against handing something prohibited to a child is limited to those items that are prohibited by a negative command (איסור לאו) but it is not prohibited to hand those items that are prohibited by a positive command (איסור עשה). As a result since the restriction against bathing on Yom Kippur is by force of a positive command it is permitted for an adult to bathe a child.

Rav Ovadiah Yosef⁴ notes that this explanation is not sufficient for Rambam who maintains that the restriction against handing a child a prohibited item includes even those items that are Rabbinically prohibited. Therefore, an additional distinction must be made. Rav Yosef, based on Rabbeinu Tam and Meiri, asserts that the distinction is whether the item is inherently prohibited, like the bugs and sheratzim mentioned in the Gemara and those items that are prohibited only because of a matter related to timing. Consequently, since the restriction against eating on Yom Kippur is related to the day rather than the food it is not encompassed by the prohibition against handing a child something that is prohibited and it is permitted to feed children on Yom Kippur.

1. ספר הישר לר"ת סי' נ"א ונ"ב (מובא בשו"ת יביע אומר דלקמן)
2. ר"ן על מסכת יומא ר"פ י"ז הכפורים
3. חכמת שלמה אר"ח סי' תר"א
4. שו"ת יביע אומר ח"ז אר"ח סי' נ"ב

MUSSAR FROM THE DAF

Have Another in Mind

אמר רבי יוחנן: בעושה דעת אביו, דכוותיה גבי עובד כוכבים דעושה על דעת ישראל, מי שרי? עובד כוכבים אדעתא דנפשיה עביד

The Gemara asks why one is required to tell a child not to turn on or extinguish a light on Shabbos, while one does not need to tell an עובד כוכבים to refrain from lighting or extinguishing a fire. Rav Yochanan answers that a child will do an action for the benefit of his father even without being asked to do it while the עובד כוכבים would do the action for his own benefit hoping that perhaps he will get some sort of payment for turning off/on the light. (per Rashi)

Why does the Gemara assume that an עכו"ם will not altruistically do the melacha for the Jew's benefit?

One of the main differences that separates the Torah from other religions is the concept of L'shma. As the Rambam (הלכות תשובה פ"ה ה"ב) states we should serve Hashem because it is the Emes. We see this Yesod in Avos (perek 1, mishna 3) where we are taught to serve Hashem not because we are looking for a reward. While other religions teach about some great benefit that will await the person at the end of their lives, Judaism is not like that. Especially, in our Gemara when we are speaking about a Baal Avodah Zarah, his whole relationship to religion is self serving. He knows deep down that his Avodah Zarah is false yet this is a way in which he can continue to serve himself and his desires.

Therefore, the Gemara assumes that the קטן can relate to his father with a desire to do something purely for him without any reward. However, the Gemara assumes that the עכו"ם is only doing the melacha for himself.

When performing a chesed for another, it is important to think about the nachas you will give them when they receive your act of kindness. Just spending time imagining how good they will feel when you do something for them, can help a person do actions with the other person in mind.

POINT TO PONDER

The Gemara says that בית דין is not obligated to separate a child who is eating non kosher food. Is it only בית דין who is not required to interfere or are the parents also exempt?

Response to last week's Point to Ponder:

Why does the Gemara use the example of אשת חרש to make the point that an אשם תלוי is only brought in circumstances where two choices were before the person one of היתר and the other of איסור and there is uncertainty as to whether the איסור was transgressed.

The ערוך לנר explains that this Gemara is really connected to the next discussion regarding a חרש. If a חרש is sometimes lucid we may be able to determine with certainty whether he was lucid at the time of קידושין which makes his wife an אשת איש דאורייתא, and it may be similar to eating one of two pieces, because we can determine the איסור. However if a חרש is always of a weak mind, we can never have certainty of איסור. Therefore שמואל is telling us that a חרש's mindset is always in doubt and therefore someone who has relations with his wife will not be subject to an אשם תלוי.

ר' יוסף שמואל שמעלקא ב"ר יצחק מערמעלשטיין ז"ל, Shelly Mermelstien לענ"ב

For more points to ponder by Rabbi Yechiel Grunhaus, or insights by Rabbi Guterman, please visit our website, dafaweek.org, or download the app

To share an insight from your Chabura please email info@dafaweek.org

The shavua matters is published by the Daf a week program under the rabbinical guidance of Harav Meir Stern shlita and Harav Shmuel Kamenetsky shlita

To sponsor a publication, please contact Rabbi Zacharia Adler, Executive Director at info@dafaweek.org or call 507-daf-week. Sponsorship for one week is \$100

Sections reprinted with permission from the Chicago Torah Center