

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Four amos for a mavoi (cont.)

Abaye cites proof to Rava's assertion that removing a door-frame changes the status of a house.

2) Closing alleyways

Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan rules that the residents of one city cannot close off an alleyway that would prevent residents of another city from using an established path.

R' Anan in the name of Shmuel rules that the public can prevent the residents of an alley from closing off their alley and restricting the public from travelling through their alleyway.

The full extent of this ruling is explained.

3) Dividing a field

The Gemara asserts that there is no dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Yehudah regarding the minimum size of a field that could be divided.

R' Yosef rules that the minimum size for dividing a field in Bavel is the area that is plowed in one day.

The Gemara explains in more detail the meaning of the phrase "an area that is plowed in a day."

The minimum sizes of a water hole and a vineyard are discussed.

A Baraisa confirms the ruling regarding the minimum size of a vineyard to be divided.

R' Yosi comments that the ruling concerning the minimum size to divide a vineyard has no logic to it.

Rava bar Kisna gives the minimum size for dividing a vineyard in Bavel.

4) Prophecy

R' Avdimi from Chaifah states that although prophecy was taken from the prophets it is still found amongst Torah scholars.

The wording of the Baraisa is explained.

Ameimar asserts that a Torah scholar is greater than a prophet.

Abaye suggests a proof that Torah scholars have prophecy.

Rava rejects that proof and offers an alternative proof to this principle.

R' Ashi rejects this proof and offers an alternative proof.

This proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yochanan asserts that prophecy was taken from prophets and given to the insane and to children.

Examples of prophecy given to the insane and children are cited.

Tangentially, the Gemara cites another teaching of R' Avdimi of Chaifah, this one related to the effect of eating and drinking.

Another exposition based on the word **נבוכ** is presented.

5) Dividing a field

R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua notes that a firstborn receives his two fields and asks whether a yavam who receives two fields also is given tracts of land that are adjacent to one another.

Abaye asserts that a yavam is also given fields that are adjacent to one another whereas Rava disagrees.

Rabbah ruled that a brother who owned property adjacent to

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Enforcing the "trait of Sedom" rule—**מדת סדום**

כגון זה כופין על מדת סדום

The Gemara illustrates various examples of situations where we enforce the "מדת סדום – trait of Sedom" rule. The concept is that we expect a person to accommodate the needs and benefits of others if doing so does not make a difference to him. For example, if one of the brothers in a family bought land adjacent to the family's property. When the father subsequently dies, and the family's estate is to be divided, this brother requests that his portion be the one next to the piece of land he already owns. It is to his advantage to have one larger piece of property rather than two pieces which are separated. Rabba says that we enforce the "trait of Sedom" rule, and we accommodate the brother who has an objective preference, while the other brothers will receive a portion either way. We do not allow the other brothers to stubbornly resist or charge for their willingness to cooperate.

Along these lines, Rav Huna b. R' Yehoshua states that it is obvious that when a firstborn is given his double portion, these two portions are to be adjacent to one another. In other words, we do not divide the portions arbitrarily and give the firstborn two of the portions even if they are in scattered locations. This halacha is taught later (daf 124a), and it is derived from a verse (Devarim 21:17). The firstborn is given "a double portion," which teaches that the two portions inherited by the firstborn are associated to each other and are viewed as being one large portion, rather than two separate pieces. Tosafos wonders, however, why we need a verse to teach that these portions are given adjacent to each other, when, according to Rabba, it is obvious that we would apply the law of **מדת סדום** to stop the other brothers from separating the portions of the firstborn.

Tosafos answers that we might have thought that the double portion of a firstborn is viewed as if it was any two portions given to two brothers, just that he gets both of them. Yet, if two brothers would join together and demand that their inheritances be given next to each other, they would have no right to demand such a thing. Furthermore, the Torah refers to the double portion

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. May the residents of an alleyway prevent the public from traversing through their alleyway?

2. Who is greater, a prophet or a Torah scholar?

3. Where do we find a young child who prophesized?

4. Explain the principle of **מדת סדום** כופין על מדת סדום?

HALACHAH Highlight

The existence of ruach hakodesh in our times

אמר ר' אבדימי דמן חיפה מיום שחרב בית המקדש ניטלה נבואה מן הנביאים וניתנה לחכמים

R' Avdimi from Haifa said: From the day of the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash prophecy was taken from the prophets and given to the Torah Scholars

There was once a teacher who spoke disparagingly of Or Hachaim Hakodesh, claiming that his commentary to the Torah was not written with ruach hakodesh. People who heard this comment were shocked and refused to send their children to be taught by this person. To confirm that their approach to this matter was correct they inquired of the Divrei Chaim to share his thoughts on the matter. Divrei Chaim¹ answered that it is evident from our Gemara that Divine Inspiration still exists. The Gemara teaches that although prophecy was taken from prophets it still is found with Torah scholars. He cites Rishonim who explain that prophecy in the form of having visions is what no longer exists but prophecy that comes in the form of wisdom continues to be found. This wisdom expresses itself in the form of assisting worthy Torah scholars to reach the truth. When Chazal say that the wisdom is given to Torah scholars they mean that Torah scholars will be able to attain knowledge that is beyond their natural abilities.

One proof to this principle is found in the Gemara Gittin (7a) that relates that Hashem agreed with the opinion of R' Avyasar. Rashi explains that Hashem revealed to him secret matters so that he would be able to navigate through difficult matters to arrive at the

(Overview...continued from page 1)

his father's field can request that the part of the field that he is allocated should be the part adjacent to his existing field.

R' Yosef disagreed and the Gemara rules in accordance with the position of R' Yosef.

Regarding two fields and two irrigation canals there is a similar dispute and the Gemara again rules in favor of the position of R' Yosef that one brother cannot demand the field adjacent to his own.

In a case of two fields and one irrigation canal, R' Yosef ruled that we honor the request of the brother who wants the tract of land that is adjacent to his land.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this ruling and the Gemara rules in accordance with the position of R' Yosef. ■

truth. An apparent difficulty with this approach is the Gemara So-tah (48b) that states that Divine spirit was taken away after the end of the era of the prophets. Divrei Chaim explains that the Gemara there refers to the Divine wisdom of prophecy but the Divine wisdom that comes to Torah scholars continues to exist. After further discussion of the matter Divrei Chaim concluded that it is evident that Or Hachaim was written with Divine inspiration and authors in every generation who are worthy merit to write their Torah works with Divine inspiration. Therefore, one who denies this is categorized as an epikuros since he contradicts the statement in our Gemara that Divine inspiration is still found. Consequently, he gave his support to those parents who refused to send their children to be taught by this teacher any more. ■

1. שו"ת דברי חיים יו"ד ח"ב סי' ק"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The sensitive heart

"קודם שיאכל יש לו שתי לבבות..."

The Yehudi Hakadosh, ז"ל, once delivered a beautiful parable regarding today's daf: "Once, there was a ruler who wished to conquer a certain city but was not successful. In desperation, the ruler disguised himself and managed to get into the city. After many days of careful spying he was certain that he would prevail. But first he needed to get back to his forces.

"As he walked towards the gate someone recognized him and rushed ahead to warn the guards. This immediately caused a great uproar that the ruler noticed as he approached the gate. He immediately ducked into an alley and raced away. On the quiet side streets he noticed a lone Jew and decided to trust him. He told him his identity and promised him anything if he would keep

him safe. The Jew agreed and secreted the king in his own home, cleverly diverting the soldiers who searched so that they could not find the ruler they wished to capture.

"After several days, the city authorities figured that the ruler must have managed to escape after all. The ruler borrowed clothing from the Jew and managed to escape. After the ruler was victorious, he fulfilled the Jew's every wish. As he was leaving the city, the Jew was unable to resist asking the powerful ruler how it had felt when the soldiers had searched for him in the Jew's home.

"At this, the ruler immediately demanded that the Jew be seized and subject to a public execution. The Jew's pleas for mercy fell on deaf ears. The day for the execution arrived, and none of his cries for mercy were answered. Just as the halter was placed around his neck, the ruler suddenly ordered the hangman to let him down.

"I have answered your question. Now you truly understand how I felt in your home!"

The Yehudi HaKadosh concluded, "This is the meaning of the words of our sages in Bava Basra: 'Before a person eats he has two hearts, and after he eats he has only one.' This can be understood to mean that it is only after one has himself undergone the pain of hunger that he can understand the suffering of a hungry fellow Jew."¹ ■

1 קדושת היהודי, ע' רכ"ז ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

of the firstborn as a "מתנה—gift," and we know that gifts are exempt from this rule.

The answer of Tosafos needs to be clarified. Why, in fact, would two brothers be denied if they wish to have their inheritances next to each other? Would this not be מדת סדום? מדת דוד explains that מדת סדום is only enforced when the advantage is objectively clear, i.e., one brother already owns land next to the ancestral land. We do not expect the brothers to have to accommodate requests made for simple personal preference. ■