

4 Shevat 5773  
Jan. 15, 2013



Shabbos Daf 104

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one is liable even if he wrote a short word that is part of a long word, i.e. *Shem* from the name *Shimon*. Although the letter *mem* in the word *Shimon* is an 'open' *mem*, and the letter *mem* in the word *Shem* is a 'closed' *mem*, a closed letter which one made open is valid.

Rav Chisda had stated that this is proof that a 'closed' letter which was written 'open,' is valid (and that is why the two first letters of the word *Shimon* is regarded as a word).

The *Gemora* challenged this from a *braisa*, and answered that Rav Chisda holds in accordance with a different *Tanna*, for it was taught in a *braisa* (regarding the libations mentioned in the Torah concerning the festival of *Sukkos*): It is written: *viniskeihem* (and their libations, written with an extra *mem*), *unesacheha* (and its libations, written with an extra *yud*), and *kimishpatam* (in accordance with their law, written with an extra *mem*), and the extra letters spell out the word *mayim*, water. This alludes to the libation of water that was performed in the Bais HaMikdash on the festival of *Sukkos*. Although the letter *mem* from the word *viniskeihem* is written as a 'closed' *mem*, the *Tanna* uses it for this exegesis as an 'open' *mem*, to spell out the word *mayim*, water. This implies that an open letter that was written closed is valid, and we can assume that a closed letter that was written as an open letter is also valid. [Therefore, one who wrote *Shem* from *Shimon* on Shabbos will be liable.]

The *Gemora* asks: How can they be compared? When an open letter is made closed, it is now elevated, for Rav Chisda said: The *mem* and the *samech* (which are round) of the Tablets were stayed in place only by a miracle. [The letters in the Tablets were engraved from one side to the other and the middle sections of these two letters were completely unattached. They remained in place only through a miracle. Evidently, the *mem* used in the Tablets was the closed one, for the opened one would not have needed a miracle.] However, if a closed letter was made open, it has been degraded, for Rabbi Yirmiyah said, and others say that it was Rabbi Chiya bar Abba who said: The letters in the Hebrew alphabet - *mem*, *nun*, *tzadi*, *pey*, *kaf*; were established by the prophets. [Since we have learned that the closed *mem* was used in the Tablets, this seems to be saying that the opened *mem* was established later on. Accordingly, we have grounds to distinguish and state that although an open *mem* that was written closed is valid, a closed *mem* that was written open might not be valid!?!]

The *Gemora* questions that teaching: Can it be that those letters were established by the prophets? But it is written: *These are the mitzvos*, and we derive from there that a prophet does not have permission to create new laws? Rather, both forms of the letters were there (in existence in the times of Moshe), but what they did not know form belonged in the middle of the word and which belonged at the end of a word, and the prophets came and established (that the open form belongs in the middle of a word, and the closed form belongs at the end). [Accordingly, the closed form of a letter is not any more



*significant than an open one, and if an open letter which was written closed is valid, so too a closed letter written in an open form will be valid as well.]*

The Gemora persists: But still, it is written: *These are the mitzvos*, and we derive from there that a prophet does not have permission to create new laws? [Accordingly, the prophets should not have been able to determine which form goes where!?!]

Rather, it must be that this information was forgotten, and the prophets reestablished them (i.e. the prophets declared that the open letters are placed in middle of the word and the closed letters are written at the end of the word).

It was stated above: Rav Chisda said: The *mem* and the *samech* (which are round) of the Tablets were stayed in place only by a miracle.

Rav Chisda also said: The writing of the Tablets could be read from the inside and the outside, e.g., *nevuv* would be read as *bovan*; *bahar* as *rahav*; and *saru* as *veras*. [These words do not actually occur in the Ten Commandments written on the Tablets, but are given as examples of typical words might be legible backwards.]

**The order of the Aleph-Beis and the shape of its letters teach various lessons.**

The Rabbis told Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi: Young scholars have come to the Study hall and said things the like of which was not said even in the days of Yehoshua bin Nun. They said: *Aleph Beis* stands for *aleph binah*, teaching insight. *Gimmel dalet* stands for *gemol dalim*, help the destitute. The leg of the *gimmel* is extended toward the *dalet* to teach us that one must run after the indigent to aid them. The leg of the *dalet* extended towards the *gimmel* teaches that the poor person should be available to the person aiding him, so that the benefactor does not have to run after the poor person. The face of the letter

*dalet* turned away from the *gimmel* teaches that one should give inconspicuously so as not to shame the poor person. The letters *dalet* and *vav* represent the Name of Hashem, and the letters *zayin*, *ches*, *tes* and *yud* teach that one who learns torah and helps the poor will be provided for by Hashem and he will earn a share in the World to Come. The open letter *mem* and the closed letter *mem* teach that certain passages of Torah should be talked about openly and others should be taught discreetly. The curved and straight *nun* symbolize the faithful person who is either bent or straight. *Samach* and *ayin* denote supporting the poor. Alternatively, those letters symbolize the idea of creating signs to acquiring Torah. The curved *peh* and the straight *peh* allude to the idea that at times one must open his mouth and other times one should keep his mouth closed. The curved *tzadi* and the bent *tzadi* hint to a bent *tzadik* and a straight *tzadik*. We learn from this apparently superfluous exegesis that only one who is exceedingly humble can acquire Torah. The letter *kuf* symbolizes Hashem, who is *kodosh*, holy, and the letter *reish* alludes to a *rasha*, a wicked person. The face of the *kuf* is turned away from the *reish* because Hashem cannot look at a wicked person. The crown on top of the letter *kuf* is turned toward the letter *reish* to teach that Hashem will tie a crown to the wicked person who repents. The leg of the letter *kuf* is hanging to teach that he can enter the door that Hashem opens for him to repent. The letter *shin* denotes falsehood and the letter *taf* denotes truth. The letters of the word *sheker*, falsehood, are near each other because falsehood is common, whereas the letters that comprise the word *emes*, truth, are distant from each other, as truth is difficult to find. The letters of the word *sheker*, falsehood, stand on one leg, as falsehood does not have a leg to stand on, and the letters of the word *emes*, truth, are on solid foundations, because truth has a stand in this world. (104a)

**The system of *at-bash* in the *Aleph-Beis* teaches more lessons.**

The system of “*at bash*” is that one starts with the first letter of the *aleph-beis*, *aleph*, and corresponding to the *aleph* is the last letter of the *aleph-beis*, *taf*, and so on.

The *Gemora* interprets the system of letters to teach the following: (*aleph-taf*) Hashem declares, Shall I desire the wicked person, (*beis-shin*) if he does not wish that My Name rest on him? (*gimmel-reish*) Shall I show him compassion, if he has violated his body? (*dalet-kuf*) He locked My doors, shall I not cut him down? This is said regarding the wicked, but regarding the righteous, we interpret the letters as follows: (*aleph-taf, beis-shin*) if you are ashamed of sin, you will dwell in the heavens. (*hey-tzadi, vav-peh*) there will be a separation between you and anger (*zayin-ayin, ches-samach, tes-nun*) you will not fear Satan. (*yud-mem, kuf-lamed*) The angel of Gehinnom requests from Hashem that all sinners, even Jews, should be delivered into Gehinnom. (104a)

**Hashem praises the Jews for being righteous.**

Using a different system of letter combinations, the *Gemora* records Hashem’s response to the angel of Gehinnom: (*aleph-ches-samach, beis-tes-ayin, gimmel-yud-peh*) I have compassion for the Jewish People as they refrain from adultery. (*dalet-chaf-tzadi*) They are innocent, upright, and righteous. (*dalet-lamed-kuf*) You, i.e. Gehinnom, have no portion in them. (*vav-mem-reish, zayin-nun-shin-tav*) Gehinnom requests of Hashem that He feed him from the seed of Sheis, i.e. gentile and Jews alike. (104a)

**Hashem refuses to submit the Jewish People to Gehinnom.**

Hashem responds to Gehinnom with another combination of letters: (*aleph-lamed, beis-mem, gimmel-nun, dalet-samach*) I will lead the Jews to Gan Eden, a

garden of myrtle. (*dalet-ayin, vav-peh*) Gehinnom declares to Hashem that it is hungry for people. (*zayin-tzadi, ches-kuf*) Hashem responds that the Jewish People are the seed of Yitzchak and cannot enter Gehinnom. (*tes-reish, yud-shin, kuf-taf*) I have many gentiles who worship idols to feed you. (104a)

**One who writes two letters on Shabbos in one state of unawareness is liable.**

One who was unaware that it was *Shabbos* and wrote two letters, and he remembers that it was *Shabbos*, is liable a chatas offering. (104b)

**One who writes on Shabbos with anything that creates an impression is liable.**

One is liable for writing on *Shabbos* whether he writes with ink, paint, red pigment, gum, cooper sulphate, and anything else that created a mark. Ink means black ink, paint means *sama*, a yellow arsenic. Red pigment is referred to as *sekarta*. Gum means gum Arabic. Copper sulfate is also called shoemaker’s blackening. (104b)

**There is a dispute regarding one who writes on his flesh.**

One who writes with ink on his flesh is liable. One who scratches letters onto his flesh is liable according to Rabbi Eliezer, but the Chachamim hold that he is exempt, as it is not the common method of writing. (104b)

**One who writes with anything that does not endure is not liable.**

One who writes with liquids that produce a black appearance, fruit juices that give the look of various colors, dust from the road, dust of a scribe, which is found at the bottom of the inkwell, or any other substance that will not last, he is Biblically exempt, but he is Rabbinically forbidden to write with these substances. (104b)



**Ben Setada made scratches on his flesh.**

Rabbi Eliezer maintains that one who scratches letters on his flesh on *Shabbos* is liable, while the Chachamim maintain that he is exempt.

Rabbi Eliezer attempted to bring a proof from Ben Setada who took out signs of witchcraft from Egypt by engraving them on his flesh. This would appear then to be a form of writing.

The Chachamim countered and said that Ben Setada was a fool and we do not bring proof from fools. (104b)

**If one writes a letter next to previously written writing, he is exempt.**

Rabbi Eliezer is of the opinion that one who adds even one thread to a garment that is already woven, is liable. It would follow that according to Rabbi Eliezer, one who writes a letter next to a letter that was already written, will be liable. Our *Mishna*, that states that if one writes a letter next to previously written writing, he is exempt, is clearly not in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer. (104b)

**If one writes over words that are written already, he is exempt.**

There is a dispute regarding a scribe who was supposed to write the Name of Hashem in a Sefer Torah, and instead intended to write the name Yehudah. The name Yehudah is similar to the letters in the Name of Hashem, except that the word Yehudah has a letter *dalet*. He ended up writing the Name of Hashem but without the required intention necessary to write the Holy Name. Rabbi Yehudah posits that the scribe can pass his quill over the Name of Hashem and have the proper intention of writing the Name. The Chachamim disagree, claiming that this is not the best way to write the Name of Hashem, and the Torah scroll is subsequently invalid.

We derive from this dispute that Rabbi Yehudah maintains that writing over previous writing is deemed writing, and therefore, according to Rabbi Yehudah, when one writes over previous writing on *Shabbos*, he is liable. According to the Chachamim, however, writing over previous writing is not deemed writing, and one who writes over previous writing on *Shabbos* is exempt. (104b)

**One who writes a letter that is the completion of a book or weaves a thread that completes the garment is liable.**

One who writes a letter that completes one of the twenty-four books of Scripture, or the final letter of a mezuzah or the scroll inside the *tefillin*, is liable. Similarly, one who weaves one thread and completes a garment, is liable. The liability mentioned here is not for *makeh bepatish*, striking a final blow. Rather, one is liable for the actual act of writing or weaving, as completing a book or a garment is significant to be considered to have performed the whole prohibited act of labor. (104b)

**If one writes one letter in Teverya and another letter in Tzipori, he is liable.**

One who writes on two walls of a house or on two pages of a notebook, and the letters cannot be read together, is exempt. This is because the letters cannot be joined together unless one cuts the part of the wall or page that was written on and joins it with the other piece of the wall or page. If one writes one letter in Teverya and one letter in Tzipori, he will be liable, as he can bring the two parts together without effecting any change in the writing surface. (104b)

**One who corrects a letter on *Shabbos* is liable.**

It is obvious that if one corrected a letter, he is liable, as we know that one who merely wrote one letter is liable. The novelty is that if one removed the roof of the letter *ches* and created two of the letter *zayin*, he is liable.



Alternatively, we are discussing a case where one removed the crown of the letter *dalet* and created a letter *reish*. One is forbidden to keep an unedited Holy Book in his possession, so fixing a letter is akin to writing the last letter of a book. (104b)

**One who intends to write one letter and ends up writing two, is liable.**

One who intended to write the letter *ches* but wrote the letter *zayin* twice, if he wrote the crowns on top of the *zayins*, he is exempt. If the *zayins* did not require crowns, however, and he wrote the two *zayins*, then he is liable. (104b-105a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***Name of Hashem Written without the Proper Intent***

A *braisa* was taught: A scribe was supposed to write the Name of Hashem in a Sefer Torah, and instead intended to write the name Yehudah. [*The name Yehudah is similar to the letters in the Name of Hashem, except that the word Yehudah has a letter "dalet" between the "vav" and the "hey."*] He forgot to insert the "*dalet*" and ended up writing the Name of Hashem but without the required intention necessary to write the Holy Name. Rabbi Yehudah posits that the scribe can pass his quill over the Name of Hashem and have the proper intention of writing the Name. The *Chachamim* disagree, claiming that this is not the best way to write the Name of Hashem (*and the Sefer Torah is subsequently invalid*).

The Rishonim ask: According to Rav Chisda, who holds that the *Chachamim* maintain that the Sefer Torah is disqualified, why does he use the term that it is not the best way to write the Name of Hashem? This would indicate that the writing is good, but it is not written in

the most preferable method! Why didn't he say that the new writing does not accomplish anything?

The Rashba answers that they actually hold that the tracing over of the word is not regarded as an act of writing at all and the Sefer Torah is disqualified. They only used that term to discuss Rabbi Yehudah's opinion.

The Pnei Yehoshua suggests a novel approach to explain the *Chachamim's* terminology: Although the *Chachamim* maintain that the Sefer Torah is disqualified, they nevertheless hold that the Name of Hashem retains its sanctity and is forbidden to be erased. He proves that the Name of Hashem, although it wasn't written with the correct intention, cannot be erased. This is why the *Chachamim* say that it is not the best way to write the Name of Hashem.

The Tashbatz, however, proves from our *sugya* that it is permitted to erase the Name of Hashem when it is written without the correct intention.

The *Gemora* in Yoma (38a) states that Ben Kamtzar had a unique talent that he was able to write four letters with one hand at the same time and he did not teach this talent to anyone else. The *Gemora* says that this was considered a shame and due to this, he was referred to as an evil person. What were the *Chachamim* concerned about? Rashi comments that this was referring to the Name of Hashem which has four letters.

The Tosfos Yom Tov explains that there is an advantage for the Name of Hashem to be written at one time, so that His Name should not be missing for a moment.

The Minchas Chinuch has a novel approach and says that if one writes the first two letters of the Name of Hashem which is the "*yud*" and the "*hey*," that itself is one of the Name's of Hashem, and by subsequently writing the third letter, the "*vav*," it constitutes erasing Hashem's Name. Ben Kamtzar was able to avoid with his special skill.

The Emek Brocha asks that if the Name of Hashem is written without proper intent, there is no prohibition to erase it, so why should there be a prohibition here when the scribe did not intend to write the 'two letter' Name of Hashem, but rather His 'four letter' Name?

According to the Pnei Yehoshua, this is not a question, for this, in fact, a prohibition to erase the Name of Hashem, even when it is written without the proper intent!

### ***The Encounter at Mount Sinai: once and forever***

By: Meoros haDaf HaYomi

The Gemara explains in several places that we interpret from the verse "**These** are the mitzvos and laws" (Vayikra 27:34) that "a prophet must not innovate anything" and as the Gemara states (Megilah 14a), "Forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses prophesied for Israel and didn't subtract from or add to what is written in the Torah." When Mordechai and Esther instituted Purim, "the prophets were distressed about the matter; they said – it is written: "These are the mitzvos which Hashem commanded Moshe"...thus Moshe told us: no other prophet will innovate anything from now on but Mordechai and Esther want to innovate something for us. They didn't depart till Hashem showed them supports in the Torah for instituting Purim (Yerushalmi, Megilah, Ch. 1).

**The prohibition on not adding to the Torah:** Many related to the source of this prohibition, including HaGaon Rabbi Moshe Feinstein zt"l who, in his youth, wrote two long responsa on the topic in which he discussed the idea suggested by a *talmid chacham*, that the prohibition that "a prophet must not innovate anything" belongs to the definition of *bal tosif*, that one mustn't add anything to the Torah's mitzvos. Therefore, if a prophet says that Hashem told him to add a mitzvah,

we don't believe him because there is a prohibition to add to the mitzvos and surely Hashem didn't tell him a thing.

However, the author of *Igros Moshe* says that when we learn the Gemara, we realize that this explanation is incorrect. The Gemara recounts that "three thousand halachos were forgotten during the mourning for Moshe. They said to Yehoshua, "Ask." He told them, "It is not in Heaven" (Devarim, 30,12). They said to Shmuel, "Ask." He told them, "These are the mitzvos', a prophet must not innovate anything from now on." Would Yehoshua or Shmuel be **adding** to the mitzvos? If the basis for the prohibition on a prophet to innovate stems from the prohibition of *bal tosif*, these halachos are not innovated now but were given to Moshe and were forgotten and the prophet merely reveals them; he doesn't create them.

**Hashem doesn't teach us the Torah after Mount Sinai:** Rabbi Feinstein concludes, based on our Gemara, that the verse "These are the mitzvos..." was said to us because the Encounter at Mount Sinai was the last time that Hashem taught us Torah. "These are the mitzvos" – this time the Jews learn Torah from Hashem but no more. Therefore, even when halachos were forgotten and a prophet wants to teach them anew from Heaven, he will not be enabled to do so because we no longer learn Torah from Heaven. "It is not in Heaven" (Responsa *Igros Moshe*, O.C., I, 14, and see *ibid*, that he found difficulty with Ramban's commentary on the Torah, Devarim 4:2).

HaGaon Rav Yitzchak Ze'ev of Brisk zt"l learnt our Gemara in an utterly different way and reached other conclusions.

**Two different replies to the same request:** When Moshe passed away, the Jews asked Yehoshua to find out the forgotten halachos in Heaven. He replied, "It is not in Heaven." Three hundred years elapsed and their descendents asked the same request of Shmuel and he replied, "These are the mitzvos' – a prophet must not

innovate anything from now on.” Didn’t they remember what Yehoshua answered to their forefathers? And if they forgot, why did Shmuel have to answer them with another interpretation? Why didn’t he use Yehoshua’s reply that “It is not in Heaven”? We have two different questions, said the Brisker Rav, and therefore two different replies. Yehoshua was asked to clarify in Heaven what he’d heard from Moshe and was forgotten. He replied that after the giving of the Torah it is impossible to clarify anything of the halachos of the Torah by prophecy or the *urim vetumim* but only from the Torah itself by learning and interpreting it. Three hundred years later, another request was presented to Shmuel. It is impossible to clarify the old halachos. Therefore receive those halachos anew straight from the Creator and we shall again accept the yoke of those mitzvos. Shmuel replied that he could also not fulfill this request, as we are told: “These are the mitzvos” – that a prophet must not innovate anything. Nothing will be added to what was given to us at Mount Sinai (see *Kisvei HaGri"z* and we can thus explain Ramban’s above statement and see *ibid*, that he remarked from Ramban’s statement, *Hilchos Yesodei HaTorah* 9:1, and see *Pnei Yehoshua*, Megilah 3a).

Vahashem beirach es Avraham Bakol, Hashem blessed Avraham with all. Regarding Yitzchak, it is said: *v'ochal mikol*, I ate from everything (that Yaakov had brought him to receive the blessings), and regarding Yaakov it is said: *yesh li kol*, I have everything. Thus, the minister of Gehinnom was saying, give me all the Jews, even those of who it is said the word *kol*.

## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Bakol Mikol Kol***

The *Gemora* states that the minister of Gehinnom request of Hashem: *leyam kol*, all to the sea, i.e., all sinners, including Jews, should be delivered to Gehinnom.

What is the association of the sea and the word *kol*, which means all, and Gehinnom?

The *Yalkut Reuveini* quotes a *Medrash* that states that even Avraham, Yitzchak, and Yaakov must be purified in the fires of Gehinnom. We know that the patriarchs are referred to as *kol*, as regarding Avraham it is said: