

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The mitzvah of ראייה and children

Abaye, in response to R' Zeira's inquiry explains that the child's mother accompanies her child from their hometown to Yerushalayim since she is obligated to be in Yerushalayim to fulfill the mitzvah of simcha and the dispute between Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel relates to the journey from Yerushalayim to Har Habayis.

Bais Shammai's position is unsuccessfully challenged from the incident involving Shmuel.

R' Shimon inquires about the obligation of a lame child according to Bais Shammai and a blind child according to Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel concerning the mitzvah of ראייה.

Abaye answers that there is no obligation to bring these children to the Bais Hamikdash.

### 2) The cost of the korbonos

A Beraisa presents the rationale behind Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel's respective opinions concerning the cost of the Olas Re'iyah and Shalmei Simchah korbonos.

The reason each group of Tannaim rejects the position of the other is explained.

Bais Hillel's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

The challenge leads the Gemara into a discussion related to whether the Korban Olah brought at Har Sinai was a Korban Tamid or an Olas Re'iyah.

Abaye presents a list of Tannaim and their respective positions concerning this matter and the proof that this is their position.

The Gemara successfully challenges Abaye's assertion that R' Yishmael holds like Bais Shammai that the Korban Olah brought at Har Sinai was an Olas Re'iyah.

R' Chisda expresses uncertainty how to read the relevant pasuk concerning the korbonos offered at Har Sinai and the Gemara concludes that it is not clear how to read that verse. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why didn't Chanah send Shmuel to Yerushalayim with his father?  
.....
2. What is the rationale, according to Bais Hillel, why the חגיגה costs more than the ראייה?  
.....
3. Who paid for the Korban Tamid for the forty years the Jews traveled in the desert?  
.....
4. What are the two ways to read the verse in Shemos 24:5?  
.....

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The three mitzvos of the festival*

ר' יוסי הגלילי אומר שלש מצות נצטוו ישראל בעלותם לרגל—  
ראיה וחגיגה ושמחה

The Chinuch (Mitzvah #88) writes that the mitzvah of celebrating on the pilgrimage festivals requires that every male member of the Jewish nation travel to the Bais Hamikdash shortly before the holidays of Pesach, Shavuot and Sukkos. There are three mitzvos which a person must fulfill upon arriving at the Mikdash; these are to celebrate with the festival peace-offering (שלמי חגיגה), the appearance offering (עולת ראייה), and rejoicing (שלמי שמחה).

Rambam writes (Hilchos Chagiga 1:1) that the mitzvah of ראייה requires that a person come to the courtyard of the Bais Hamikdash on the first day of the festival, and bring with him an עולה offering—either a bird or a domesticated animal. If one comes empty-handed he has not only failed to complete the mitzvah, but he is also in violation of the negative command לא יראו פני ריקם—do not appear empty-handed.” (Shemos 23:15)

The mitzvah of Chagiga is to come on the first day of the festival and to bring a peace-offering (שלמים). Women are not obligated to bring these first two offerings. Finally, the mitzvah of שמחה is to bring more שלמים offerings than the Chagiga alone.

The Chinuch continues and explains that the root of this mitzvah is that a person should not arrive empty-handed before Hashem. Even though the truth is that Hashem needs nothing from our hands, nevertheless, in the image of our minds we see it as though we are to stand in His presence. And in truth, people are closer to goodness in that place, more than in any other place. “The light of the King's countenance” (Mishle 16:15) is radiant upon them there. Therefore it is fitting for us to perform the deed of bringing the offering at that time. For through the act of bringing the offering we would become prepared to receive the reward of goodness, and our spirits would be exalted to an ever higher degree. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in memory of  
Yitzchok Shlomo z"l ben Harav Yisroel Yechiel Fishman Shlit"a  
by the Block family

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Training a child to perform a Rabbinic mitzvah

אמר אביי כל כיהא דגדול מיחייב מדאורייתא קטן נמי מחנכינ ליה מדרבנן כל היכה דגדול פטור מדאורייתא מדרבנן נמי פטור

*Abaye answered whenever an adult is Biblically obligated to perform a mitzvah a child is trained, under Rabbinic law, to perform that mitzvah and whenever an adult is Biblically exempt from performing a mitzvah a child is not trained, under Rabbinic law, to perform that mitzvah.*

Rav Yosef Chaim Dovid Azulai<sup>1</sup>, the Gaon Chida, cites an authority who is uncertain if there is an obligation to train children to take a lulav after the first day of Sukkos, since on the remaining days the obligation to take a lulav is only Rabbinic and our Gemara clearly states that we only train children to perform those mitzvos that, for adults, involve a Biblical obligation. He writes, however, that there is a distinction between taking the lulav and birkas hamazon, Chanukah and Purim, but he does not explain the distinction.

Rav Yaakov Ettlinger<sup>2</sup>, the Aruch L'ner, explains the distinction. Concerning the mitzvos of Chanukah and Purim, since the origin of these mitzvos are Rabbinic if a child is not trained to perform them he will not be able to fulfill

them when he becomes an adult, therefore, there is an obligation to train a child to perform these mitzvos. Lulav, on the other hand, affords an opportunity for the child to be trained for the Biblical command, i.e. taking the lulav on the first day of Sukkos; consequently, as there is no risk that the child will miss his training in this mitzvah it is possible that he is trained only when the mitzvah is Biblical in origin.

Aruch L'ner, however, refutes the proof suggested from our Gemara. When the Gemara makes reference to the Biblical obligation of the mitzvah of ראייה it did not intend to exclude the Rabbinic obligation of this mitzvah because there is no Rabbinic obligation for this mitzvah. Rather the intent of the Gemara was to state that in circumstances when an adult is obligated to perform a mitzvah there is a Rabbinic obligation to train children to perform the mitzvah as well. Whether the mitzvah is of Biblical or Rabbinic origin is not the issue, but whether there is an obligation for the adult to perform this mitzvah. Other authorities<sup>3</sup> disagree and maintain that there is no mitzvah to train children to perform mitzvos that Rabbinic in origin. ■

1. ברכי יוסף אר"ח סי' תרנ"ז אות ג' בשם הרב בתי כהונה כ"י
2. ביכורי יעקב שם סק"ד
3. ע' שו"ת רמ"ע מפאנו סי' קי"א וא"ר בדעת הלבוש סי' קפ"ו סק"ג ועוד ואכמ"ל ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### A child's obligation

בחיגר שיכול להתפשט

Our Gemara asks whether the father of a lame child who will be healed before he reaches adulthood is obligated to bring the child to Yerushalayim on the festival just as if he was sound. Abaye answers that such a parent is not obligated since he is only duty-bound to educate his child to fulfill commandments that an adult would have to fulfill under those exact circumstances. Since a lame adult has no chiyuv aliyah l'regel, the child is likewise not obligated to travel in that situation. Chinuch means preparing the child for the adult fulfillment of mitzvos, and it can also mean careful pruning of behav-

iors that would otherwise persist into adulthood.

Rav Yaakov Kaminetsky, zt"l, was once spending Shabbos at a man's home, when the three-year-old son of his host climbed onto the Shabbos table and walked across it to grab a grape. The boy's father gave him a slap for his misbehavior.

Rav Yaakov told the father that his action was inappropriate. Had the boy been chutzpadik, a slap would have indeed been in order; chutzpah is an ingrained bad trait that must be corrected early. If steps are not taken while the child is young, the boy would be uncontrollably arrogant by the time he reached his teens.

"However," continued Rav Yaakov, "your son is unlikely to walk across a table when he is a teenager, so you do not need to discipline him so sharply

for it now. By all means, explain that it is not correct, but save the slap for something that deserves it!"

Although the father mentioned in this anecdote was unaware of the halachah that emerges from our Gemara, there were some Gedolim who understood this concept even as children.

One Yom Kippur, the young boy who would grow to be the Avnei Nezer, zt"l, went home to eat. When he returned after his meal, his father asked if he had made kiddush.

The prodigy responded, "I only do mitzvos because of the rabbinical obligation of chinuch. Since when I will be an adult I will certainly fast on Yom Kippur like all other Jews, there is no reason for me to have made kiddush now. It is not chinuch for me to learn what I will not be doing when I will be grown!" ■

