Volume 1. Issue 9.



# Free for All

The first *Mishnah* in the eighth and final *perek* teaches that once the poor have stopped taking the *matanot ani'im*, anyone can take the gifts, irrespective of their financial status. The *Mishnah* provides the indicators of when this happens for the different *matanot ani'im*. What halachic mechanism enables these *matanot ani'im* to be taken by anybody?

The Rambam writes as follows (Matanot Ani'im 1:10):

It states by the gifts of the poor, "to the poor and the proselyte shall you leave them" [to imply] the entire time they request them [it must be left for them]. As soon as the poor stop asking and searching for them, the gifts are permitted to everybody. [Why?] Because they are not sanctified like *trumah*, and we are not required to give the poor its value because it does not write "give", rather it writes "leave". Furthermore there is no *mitzvah* to leave it for the animals and birds, only to the poor and there are none.

It appears that the source of this law is a *gzeirat ha'katuv* – a *pasuk* from the *Torah*. The position runs into difficulty as the *Gemarah* (*Bava Metzia* 21b) seems to suggest a different, more general reason. There the *Gemarah* bases this law on *yi'ush*. In other words, everyone can take the *matanot ani'im* because the poor have resigned ownership.<sup>1</sup>

Surely *yi'ush* alone would be enough to allow others to take the *matanot ani'im* (see *Rashi Ta'anit* 6b). Furthermore, the *Rambam* in the next *Halacha* also appears to use *yi'ush* as a measure of when the *matanot ani'im* are available to everyone. Why then does the *Rambam* need a *pasuk*?

The *Rav z"l* gives two different responses to this question (*Igrot HaGri"d Matanot Ani'im* 1:10). He begins by explaining that the exposition from the *pasuk* the *Rambam* uses (i.e. "to the poor and the proselyte shall you leave them" and not to animals and birds) comes from another *Gemarah* (*Chulin* 134b) where *Levi* planted produce in an

area where there were no poor people to collect the gifts. *Rav Sheshet* applied this exposition in this context. The *Rav* therefore explains that the *pasuk* teaches that when there are no poor people at all, there is no *mitzvah* to leave the *matanot ani'im*. The case in *Bava Metzia* however is where there were poor people, and they have stopped coming. Consequently, the *mitzvah* of leaving the gifts was initiated and the gifts have already become property of the poor. In this case, one needs *yi'ush* to enable anyone else to take the gifts.

The Rav bases his second answer on another Gemarah (Bava Kama 94a) which discusses R' Yishmael's opinion regarding *peah* flour that was used to make bread. The Gemarah concludes that in general R' Yishmael holds that changing the form of an object (shinui) acquires the object, meaning that if the flour, eg, was stolen, he would need to return the value of the flour not the bread. In this case however *peah* is separated from the bread itself which is learnt from the superfluous word "you shall leave" included in the p'sukim. One should note that the Rambam rules according to this Gemarah (Gzeila Ve'Aveida 2:1, Matanot Ani'im 1:2). The Rav explains that this law teaches that the matanot ani'im are unique because the transfer to the poor people's ownership is not a one-off event, but can happen continually. Consequently, in our case, yi'ush alone is not enough to prevent it for become poor property once again. *Rambam* therefore required the *pasuk* to enable the *matanot* ani'im to prevent it from becoming poor property once again after yi'ush.

A final idea may be proposed. In the past few weeks it has been suggested that *matanot ani'im* is much more than just an issue of ownership. There is also the biblical obligation of leaving these portions for the poor. Just like the *Gra"ch* (see issue 7) suggests that *migo* can only be applied in monetary issues and not for *issurim*, perhaps here as well, *yi'ush* can only solve the monetary component. Perhaps this is why the *Rambam* also required a *pasuk* to teach that once the poor have stopped collecting the *matanot ani'im* the *issur* is also removed.

#### David Bankier

<sup>1</sup> The *Gemarah* raises this case in the context of a debate whether *yi'ush* shlo mi'da'at is considered *yi'ush*. In other word, if when someone finds out about the object (eg, that they lost) they would instantly resign ownership, is ownership already considered resigned? Initially, the *Gemarah* thinks that this is an example of such a case, since we assume

*yi'ush* for all poor people, including those outside the city that have no knowledge about the status of the field. It rejects this as a proof, claiming that those outside the city resigned ownership from the outset as they assumed the local poor people would collect the gifts.

is kindly sponsored by Agnes Bankier in memory of:

צבי הרש בן ישראל עייה Ferenc Fulop

## **Revision Questions**

פאה וי :זי – חי :אי

- What is the limit on the size of forgotten standing wheat for it to be considered *shichecha*? Is there a difference if there is an unusually small yield in the forgotten area? (13: 1)
- How much standing wheat is required to save nearby forgotten standing wheat or sheaves from becoming *shichecha*? (η: -η)
- Can sheaves save forgotten standing wheat or sheaves from becoming *shichecha?* (*r*:*n*)
- Do standing and cut wheat or onions and garlic combine to the measure that exempts them from *shichecha*? Include *R' Yosi's* opinion. (*v*: *v*)
- Produce that have particular uses are exempt from *shichecha* what are these uses? (*v*: *v*)
- Explain the debate regarding whether produce that grows underground are exempt from *shichecha*? (*v*: *v*)
- Does *shichecha* apply to produce forgotten by a blind person, or produce that was cut at night? (רי:ייא)
- What is the effect of making the following condition: I am reaping my field on the condition that I will take anything I forget? (איייא)
- What three qualities of an olive tree would exempt it from the law of shichecha? (ז׳:אי)
- Explain the opinion of *R' Yosi* with regards to *shichecha* and olive trees. ('κ: 't)
  Explain the law of *sata'im* by olive trees? [Note: this *mishnah* is understood differently by the *Rishonim*] (':: τ')
- What is *peret*? (ז': ג')
- Can someone place a basket under the vine when picking grapes? (*i*): (*i*)
- What is *olelot*? (*ז*: די)
- Explain the debate regarding the restrictions on where one can prune his vine?
   (*r*): (*r*)
- What is kerem reva'i? To what other law is it similar? (7: 'r)
- *Beit Shammai* and *Beit Hillel* argue whether a number of laws also apply to *kerem reva'i* what are they? (7: \*)
- What is the law regarding a vineyard that contains only clusters of *olelot*? ('i: 'i)
- If someone sanctifies their vineyard, are the poor still able to take *olelot?* (*r*::*n*)
- What type of vines are aris and rogliyot and when does shichecha apply?
   ('ı: יז)
- When are the general public allowed to take: (ח׳ :אי)
  - o *leket*?
  - *peret* and *olelot*?
  - Matanot ani'im from olive trees?

### Local Shiurim

Sunday -Thursday Between mincha & ma'ariv <u>Mizrachi Shul</u> David Bankier

9:50pm (after ma'ariv) <u>Beit Midrash -</u> <u>Naftali Herc</u> Yehuda Gottlieb

Friday & Shabbat 10 minutes before mincha Mizrachi Shul

Audio Shiurim on-line! www.shemayisrael.com/ mishna/

#### SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Mishnah Yomit publications are currently be sent to subscribers in Australia, Israel, England and USA.

If you are going away, send an email to mishnahyomit@hotmail.com and we will send you the *Mishnah Yomit* publication.

To add another mishnah yomit shiur send an email to: mishnahyomit@hotmail.com

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
5 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כייב כסלו	6 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כייג כסלו	7 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כייד כסלו	8 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כייה כסלו	9 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כייו כסלו	10 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כ״ז כסלו	11 <sup>th</sup> Dec. כ״ח כסלו
Peah 8: 2-3	Peah 8: 4-5	Peah 8:6-7	Peah 8: 8-9	Demai 1: 1-2	Demai 1: 3-4	Demai 2: 1-2
			I	I	I	3

## Next Week's Mishnayot...