

מאי איכא בין ברכה לשקדו –

What difference is there between *Brocho* and *Shokdu*

OVERVIEW

The גמרא offered two reasons why an אלמנה is 'נשאת בה' and 'נבעלת בו'; one because on 'ו' there was a ברכה לאדם, and also because the חכמים were שקדו that when an אלמנה weds, her husband should rejoice with her for three days. The גמרא asks, is there a difference whether the reason is because of ברכה or because of שקדו. The גמרא answers this question. תוספות explains why the גמרא did not give another difference.

תוספות anticipates a difficulty:

אף על גב דמשום ברכה לא מיקרי עבריינא¹ -

And even though that on account of ברכה alone he will not be considered a 'transgressor' if she is not married 'בה' ונבעלת בו', so why did the גמרא asks, 'what is the difference' when there is an obvious difference –

תוספות responds:

מכל מקום בעי למה לי טעמא דברכה² -

Nevertheless, the גמרא asks why the reason of ברכה is necessary;³ the תקנה of שקדו is sufficient to explain why 'נבעלת בה' ונבעלת בו' and he will be called an עבריינא if he does not comply. Seemingly the reason of ברכה does not add anything –

תוספות offers an alternate explanation of the question 'מאי איכא וכו':

אי נמי⁴ בעי מאי איכא בין לישנא דמשני ברכה דאדם עדיפא ליה⁵ -

Or you may also say; the גמרא asks what is the difference between the view

¹ The reason of ברכה is merely good advice to marry then (which they may choose to ignore), but it is not an obligation, as opposed to שקדו which is an enactment which the חכמים imposed and must be followed.

² This indicates (as תוספות states later) that the one who maintains the reason of ברכה also maintains the reason of שקדו; otherwise what question is there why do we need ברכה, it is needed if we do not maintain שקדו.

³ See 'Thinking it over'.

⁴ The second answer of תוס' is that the question of 'מאי איכא בין ברכה לשקדו' is not what is the difference between the two תקנות (the תקנה of ברכה לאדם and the תקנה of שקדו), but rather what is the difference between the two answers which the גמרא gave to the question of why an אלמנה is not 'נבעלת בה' like a בתולה.

⁵ This answer (that ברכה דאדם עדיפא ליה) as well as the second answer (of שקדו) both agree that there are two causes why an אלמנה is 'נבעלת בו' (see previous א"נ תוס' ד"ה א"נ [that ברכה agrees with שקדו] and the end of this תוספות [that ברכה agrees to שקדו]), however they argue which is the main reason. The first answer maintains that ברכה לאדם is the main reason, while the second answer maintains that שקדו is the main reason. Since both maintain both reasons, the גמרא could not have answered 'עבריינא איכא בינייהו', since according to both answers he will be considered an עבריינא, for they both agree to the reason of שקדו. Therefore the גמרא offers a different answer.

which answered that the **ברכה to אדם is preferable** than the **ברכה to דגים** -
ובין לישנא דאי נמי משום שקדו -

And the view of the א"נ (the second answer) that the reason is **because of שקדו** -
ומשני⁶ דאיכא בינייהו אדם בטל אי נמי יום טוב שחל להיות כולי -

And the גמרא answered that the difference between them is regarding an idle person, or when יו"ט occurs on שבת ערב, etc.

דללישנא דטעמא דברייתא משום שקדו ולא משום ברכה⁷ -

For according to the view that the reason the ברייתא rules 'נבעלת בו' is because of שקדו, but not because of ברכה (the second answer) -

הכא דליכא שקדו נבעלת אם ירצה בחמישי -

Here in the cases of אדם בטל or בער"ש, where there is no concern of שקדו, she may be 'נבעלת בה' if he wants -

אבל ללישנא קמא דטעמא דברייתא משום ברכה כדמשמע פשטא דברייתא -

However according to the first view that the reason of the ברייתא (why the ברייתא is because of לאדם, as the simple reading of the ברייתא indicates, then -

אפילו באדם בטל או ביום טוב שחל להיות בערב שבת דליכא משום שקדו⁸ -

Even by an אדם בטל or if יו"ט occurs on ער"ש where there is no שקדו -

מכל מקום משום ברכה תבעל בששי -

Nevertheless she should be 'נבעלת בו' because of the ברכה לאדם.

תוספות concludes:

ואפילו להאי לישנא אי לאו שתקנו משום שקדו -

And even according to this latter view that the טעמא דברייתא is because of ברכה; nevertheless were it not that they instituted on account of שקדו that 'נבעלת בו' -

משום ברכה לחודה לא היו קובעים יום כדפרישית לעיל⁹ גבי ותנשא באחד בשבת:

⁶ The necessity for תוספות to explain the answer of the גמרא is more apparent if we assume the second answer of תוספות. According to the first answer that the question was why do we need the reason of ברכה, the answer is self-understood that it is necessary for אדם בטל וכו' since there is no שקדו. However according to the second explanation of תוספות that both answers agree that we need both reasons (of ברכה and שקדו [see footnote # 5]) it is not so clearly understood what the גמרא means that איכא בינייהו אדם, since both agree to the סברא of ברכה, therefore it is necessary for תוספות to explain the answer.

⁷ Even though that according to the answer of שקדו they also agree that there is the reason of ברכה (see footnote # 5), however the purpose of ברכה לאדם was just to explain why the אלמנה should not be 'נבעלת בה' like the בתולה (and we should not enact שקדו [see previous א"נ ד"ה תוס' ד"ה א"נ]), but not that ברכה is the main reason why 'נבעלת בו'. Therefore if there is no reason of שקדו, she may be 'נבעלת בה'.

⁸ He will not go to work on Friday either because he is an אדם בטל or because it is יו"ט.

⁹ לעיל ב,א (ד"ה ותנשא). The reason is that ברכה is merely an עצה טובה and we cannot base a תק"ח on an עצה טובה alone. See also תוס' ד"ה אשה.

The חכמים would not have established a day when an אלמנה should be נבעלת, on account of ברכה alone, as I explained previously regarding the גמרא which asked, 'and let her marry on Sunday'.

SUMMARY

The question of מאי איכא is either why do we need the reason of ברכה, or what is the difference between the two answers of the גמרא (since both maintain both reasons of ברכה and שקדו). The חכמים would never enact a תקנה on the basis of ברכה alone.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספות explained (in the first answer) that the question of the גמרא what is the difference, etc., means why is the reason of ברכה necessary.¹⁰ However תוספות said previously¹¹ that even if we maintain שקדו we need to the reason of ברכה to explain why she should not be נבעלת בה' like a בתולה, so how can תוס' here say that the question is why do we need the reason of ברכה?!¹²

¹⁰ See footnote # 3.

¹¹ ד"ה א"נ.

¹² See מהרש"ל.