

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

20 Tammuz 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 5

July 2, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.

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

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,

where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

It became Concealed

It was stated above: How do we know one is only liable if he knows originally, forgets, and then remembers? The verse says: “*But it became concealed,*” “*But it became concealed*” twice. [This teaches us that he is only liable to bring a *korban* if he was aware that he was *tamei*, forgot, committed the transgression, and then became aware of it. Accordingly, he maintains that a *korban* is only brought if he was unaware that he was *tamei*, not if he was unaware that it was *kodesh*.] These are the words of Rabbi Akiva. Rebbe says: This is not needed. The verse says: “*But it became concealed,*” implying that he once knew. It then says “*And he knew*” implying that he knew once again. Why does it say, “*But it became concealed*” twice? This teaches us that one is liable if he was unaware that he was *tamei*, or if he was unaware that it was *kodesh*.

The master said: The verse says: “*But it became concealed,*” implying that he once knew.

Rava explains that it could have said: *and it was concealed from him*.

Abaye asks: If so, regarding the *sotah* (the wife suspected of infidelity), when the torah writes: *And it was concealed from the eyes of her husband,*

will you infer from this also that he knew initially (that she did, in fact, cohabit with that man)? Surely not, for if he knew, the waters would not test her, as it was taught in a *braisa*: *And the husband shall be clear from sin, and that wife shall bear her sin*. This teaches us that the bitter waters of the *sotah* will only examine her if the husband is free from any sin (involving illicit relations); however, if he is not free of sin, the waters will not examine her. [And if he had relations with her after he knew that she cohabited with another man, he is not clear from sin!?] And furthermore, in connection with the Torah, it is written: *It was concealed from the eyes of all living, and from those that soar in the heavens it was hidden*. Will you conclude from this that someone knew it (the full value of the Torah)? That cannot be, for it is written: *No man knew its extent*.

Rather, said Abaye, Rebbe holds that the awareness gained from his childhood teacher is also called knowledge. [And as long as he did not forget this learning, and he realized that he came into contact with a source of *tumah*, this is regarded as “awareness in the beginning,” even though he did not “connect the dots” that he is now *tamei*.]

Rav Pappa asked Abaye: If so, what does the *Mishna* mean when it stated the case where he had no awareness in the beginning, but he was aware at the end? Is there anyone who did not have even the knowledge gained from his childhood teacher?

He replied: Yes! It is possible regarding a child taken into captivity and raised amongst gentiles. (5a)

Taking Out

The *Mishna* had stated: There are two laws concerning carrying on *Shabbos* which, in actuality, are four.

The *Gemora* cites the *Mishna* in *Shabbos*: There are two laws concerning taking out on *Shabbos* which, in actuality, are four, regarding bringing things inside. There are two laws concerning taking out on *Shabbos* which, in actuality, are four, regarding taking things outside.

The *Gemora* asks: Why does our *Mishna* discuss only four cases where there it discusses eight?

The *Gemora* answers that there, where the primary topic is the laws of *Shabbos*, the *Mishna* lists the two forms of work that are forbidden on *Shabbos*: *Avos*, primary acts of labor, and *Toldos*, secondary acts of labor. However, here, where the purpose of the *Mishna* is not primarily to discuss the laws of *Shabbos*, the *Mishna* lists only the main categories, and not the secondary acts.

The *Gemora* asks: Which are the main categories? Taking out. But the laws of taking out are only two, and our *Mishna* says that there are two which is four!? And perhaps you will say that our *Mishna* means that there are two cases of taking out which are punishable, and two which are not, that cannot be, for they are mentioned together with the laws of *tzara'as*, and just as those all cause liability, so are these!?

Rather, Rav Pappa said: The other *Mishna*, which deals primarily with the laws of *Shabbos*, mentions those which are punishable, and those which are not; whereas our *Mishna* mentions only those which are punishable, and not those which are not.

The *Gemora* asks: Which are those that are punishable? Taking out: . But the laws of taking out are only two, and our *Mishna* says that there are two which is four!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* means that there are two cases of taking out and two cases of bringing in.

The *Gemora* asks: But the *Mishna* says “taking out”!?

Rav Ashi answers: The *Tanna* calls “bringing in” also “taking out.” How is this known? It is because we learned in a *Mishna*: He who takes out from one domain to another domain on *Shabbos* is liable. And are we not concerned there also with “bringing in,” and yet it is called “taking out”!

The *Gemora* rejects this proof: Perhaps the *Tanna* means carrying out from a private domain to a public domain!?

The *Gemora* answers: If so, let him say distinctly: He who takes out from a private domain to a public domain is liable; why does he say: from one domain to another domain? He obviously is including even a case of bringing in from a public domain to a private domain, and yet, he calls it “taking out.”

What is the reason for this? It is because the *Tanna* refers to any removal of an object from its place as “taking out.”

Ravina said: The *Mishna* also provides support to this view, for it states: here are two laws concerning taking out on *Shabbos* which, in actuality, are four, regarding bringing things

inside. There are two laws concerning taking out on *Shabbos* which, in actuality, are four, regarding taking things outside. Although the *Mishna* uses the expression “taking out,” it nevertheless goes on to explain the cases of “bringing in.” This is indeed a conclusive proof.

Rava said: The *Tanna* means domains; there are two kinds of domain with regard to carrying on *Shabbos*. (5a – 5b)

Shades of Tzara'as

The *Mishna* had stated: There are two types of *tzara'as* (a group of skin conditions, for which the *Torah* decrees *tumah*) which become four.

We have learned in a *Mishna*: The shades of *tzara'as* afflictions are two, subdivided into four: *Baheres* is intensively white, like snow; secondary to it is white like the lime of the Sanctuary. *Se'eis* is like white wool; secondary to it is white like the membrane of an egg.

Rabbi ChHanina said: The *Tanna* who stated this *Mishna* of *tzara'as* afflictions is not Rabbi Akiva, for if it were Rabbi Akiva, then, since elsewhere he enumerates the shades of *tzara'as* in order of brightness, then accordingly, you have purified white like the lime of the Sanctuary, for it cannot combine with any other shade; for, with which shade will you combine it? You cannot combine it with *baheres*, for there is *se'eis* which is one degree higher than the lime white intervening (and shades that are two degrees apart from each other cannot combine). It cannot be combined with *se'eis*, for it is not its derivative.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, the same rationale should apply to the white like the membrane of an egg (that it cannot be combined with any other shade)!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is not difficult, for there is a Scriptural verse which indicates to us

that it can combine with *se'eis* (even though they are two degrees apart).

The *Gemora* therefore concludes that it is clear that the *Mishna* is not in accordance with Rabbi Akiva. (5b – 6a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Shame and Embarrassment

The examination of the *nega'im* detailed in our *sugya* requires much study. When a *Kohen* goes to see a suspect *tsara'as*, he is accompanied by many young *kohanim* who come to learn. It is obvious that the person afflicted does not enjoy great honor in such a situation. According to the *Netziv*, this is explicitly mentioned in the *Torah*: “This is the law...to **teach** about the day of becoming *tamei* and the day of becoming *tahor*” (Vayikra 14:54-57). In other words, a *kohen* calls his students to come with him to be taught. The *Torah* thereafter concludes: “...this is the law of *tzara'as*” – this is the penalty of a slanderer, who insulted others (*Ha'amek Davar*).

Three Sorts of Metzora'im

There are three types of *tzara'as*: *s'eis*, *sapachas* and *baheres*. HaGaon Rav Moshe Sternbuch explains that these names express the nature of those who slander:

1. *S'eis* (a raised mark): someone who slanders with the object of rising above another.
2. *Sapachas* (an “accompanying” mark): someone who slanders because he blindly follows those around him.
3. *Baheres* (a bright mark): someone who slanders with the object of “clarifying” the truth...

But all of them are “the plague of *tsara'as* (*Ta'am Veda'as*, Vayikra 13:2). (Hame'or)