



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara answers that generally Rebbi expounds using generalizations and specifications but in this context he expounds using the amplification-limitation method.

The reason Rabanan disagree with Rebbi's exposition is explained.

One last point of clarification is made.

2) Violating the Beis HaMikdash or its sacred items

A Beraisa teaches that one is liable for a korban for violating the Beis HaMikdash or its sacred items only if there is awareness at the beginning and unawareness at the end.

Rava explains how the term **ונעלם** implies that he knew initially.

Abaye challenges this interpretation and offers an alternative interpretation.

R' Pappa unsuccessfully challenges this interpretation.

3) Transfers of Shabbos

The Gemara wonders why the Mishnah in Shabbos mentions two cases of transfers where two are four and yet in our Mishnah the Mishnah just mentions generally that when it comes to transfers on Shabbos there are two that are four.

The reason for this is that Masseches Shabbos is the primary place to discuss matters related to Shabbos so the Mishnah elaborates further as opposed to our Mishnah where Shabbos is not the primary topic.

This explanation is successfully challenged and R' Pap-

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

The halachos of Shabbos are two that are four...

מאי שנה הכא דתנא שתיים שהן ד' ותו לא. ומאי שנה התם דתני שתיים שהן ארבע בפנים ושתיים שהן ארבע בחוץ

The Gemara notes that our Mishnah (2a) summarizes the halachos of Shabbos simply as being "two that are four," while the parallel Mishnah which introduces these guidelines in Shabbos (2a) summarizes the halachos of Shabbos as being "two that are four inside, and two that are four outside." The Gemara probes to understand why the two Mishnayos differ in how they report the halachah of Shabbos.

Rav Pappa points out that our Gemara is not primarily dealing with the halachos of Shabbos. Therefore, our Mishnah only refers to cases which are **חייב**. The two cases of taking an item out from the private domain to the public domain are one for the poor man who is outside, and one for the home owner. The additional two cases are bringing an item into the house from the street, one is the act of the poor man, and one is the act of the home owner. These cases are each fully **חייב** as a Torah violation of Shabbos.

Rav Pappa continues and explains that the Mishnah in Shabbos adds four more cases which are **דרבנן**. These are where the poor person and the home owner each did half the act, either just picking up the item or just placing it down.

Tosafos (**ד"ה ומאי שנה**) wonders why the Gemara did not realize that the illustrations of the halachos of Shabbos in our Mishnah had to be parallel to the case of "two that are four" that are taught in reference to the appearances of plagues which also appear in our Mishnah. Just as all four shades of plagues mentioned are Torah-level cases, so too should the cases of Shabbos be ones that are liable on a Torah level. Why, then, did the Gemara not realize this before Rav Pappa needed to point it out?

Tosafos answers that the Gemara thought that even if the halachos of Shabbos would have been presented in their expanded format, "two that are four inside, and two that are four outside," this would comprise four (out of eight) examples of Torah liability, which would be consistent with what we find regarding the appearances of plagues. Tosafos cites another answer in the name of Rabeinu Moshe that the Gemara knew that the listing of the halachos of Shabbos could be styled to be parallel with the list of appearances of plagues, but the Gemara thought that just in order to have a consistent style in the Mishnah did not justify the Mishnah scaling back and providing a partial listing of the halachos of Shabbos. This is why the Gemara questioned why the listing regarding the halachos of Shabbos in our Mishnah is incomplete. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Does a **כלל ופרט וכלל** have to appear in that specific order?

2. What is **ידיעת בית רבו**?

3. How do we know that the term **יציאה**—taking out—includes bringing in?

4. Why did the Gemara assume that the Mishnah regarding blemishes was not consistent with R' Akiva?

HALACHAH Highlight

Establishing paternity

בזמן שהאיש מנוקה מעון המים בודקין את אשתו

When the husband is innocent of sin the waters will examine his wife

The Gemara Chullin (11a-b) asks for the source for the halachic principle that we follow the majority. One of the proofs that the Gemara presents is the halacha that we execute a person who strikes his father. Why should any child be executed for striking a father when the possibility exists that his mother had an adulterous relationship? It must be based on the principle that we follow the majority and that majority indicates that women are most often with their husbands. Sefer Rosh Yosef¹ cites numerous authorities who question the conclusion of the Gemara in Chullin. Perhaps the only time it would be possible to execute a child for hitting his father is in a case of a sotah. If a woman drank the bitter waters of the sotah and it had no effect we have proof that she never had an adulterous relationship. Consequently, we know with certainty the paternity of the children and they can be executed for striking their father. Rosh Yosef notes that the lack of effect from the bitter waters doesn't necessarily prove anything since, as our Gemara teaches, if the husband is not innocent of sin the waters will have no effect on his wife. Therefore, we revert back to the Gemara in Chullin's conclusion that executing a child who strikes his father is based on the principle of majority.

Rosh Yosef then suggests a case where it could be

(Overview...continued from page 1)

pa offers an alternative explanation for the difference between the two Mishnayos.

R' Pappa's explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Ravina cites further support for this explanation.

Rava offers another explanation of the term יציאות.

4) Tzara'as

The Mishnah that elaborates on the two types of tzaraas that are four is cited.

R' Chanina asserts that the Mishnah does not follow R' Akiva's position.

This assertion is challenged. ■

known with certainty that the children are not the product of an adulterous affair. If a man had two wives and both of them became sotahs. The first wife suffered the deathly effects of the bitter waters indicating that the husband was innocent of sin, following the rule we find on our daf, that the waters only checked the woman if the husband was innocent of any wrongdoing. If the second wife drinks the bitter waters without consequence it can be stated with certainty that she did not have an adulterous affair. Accordingly, there is no source for the principle of majority. He then rejects this approach because even in this case it cannot be said that the sotah was never with another man since according to Rambam the bitter waters do not test a woman to determine whether she was raped by another man. ■

1. ראש יוסף למס' חולקין י"א: ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"The Torah of God is Perfect"

"אורייתא מי איכא מאן דידע לה..."

The Beis Yisrael of Gur, זת"ל, once described a very interesting letter he received from a certain lamdan named Rav Avigdor. Rav Avigdor recounted an exchange between himself and the Sefas Emes, זת"ל, which took place the first time he went to see the rebbe when Rav Avigdor was still a young man. Rav Avigdor wrote, "The Sefas Emes asked me if I can learn and I re-

plied humbly, 'Perhaps I know a little.'

"The Sefas Emes replied, 'And who can say they know more than a little?'"

The Imrei Emes explained that this was not merely a clever reply. "This is the proper attitude for every Jew. He should diminish his ego until he feels as though he is just about to begin. Even if he is a huge lamdan, he should feel as though he only knows a little..."

The Pnei Menachem, זת"ל, explained why even a great scholar should feel as though he knows only a little. After all, doesn't this kind of false self-estimation betray a lack of self-knowledge? "We can understand this

statement through the Kotzker Rebbe's explanation of the verse, 'תורת ה' — The Torah of God is complete, it restores the soul.' This teaches that no matter how much one has learned the Torah, it is still completely pure and untouched. Since the Torah is endless, one is always in the stage of not yet having begun to truly fathom its depth."

He concluded, "In truth, this is an explicit Gemara in Shvuos 5. The Gemara states, 'אורייתא מי איכא מאן דידע לה — The Torah—can anyone be said to know it?'"¹ ■

1. פאר ישראל, ח"ב, ע' ר"פ ■