

25 Iyar 5777
May 21, 2017



Bava Basra Daf 119

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The Master stated: The sons (of the spies and the complainants) received [shares] by virtue of the rights of the fathers of their fathers and the rights of the fathers of their mothers.

The Gemora asks: Was it not taught [elsewhere]: by virtue of their own rights?

The Gemora answers: [This is] no difficulty. That (the first braisa) is in agreement with the one who said [that the division was] in accordance with [the number of] those who came out of Egypt (and therefore, the children, who were not among those who left Egypt, were not allotted portions by their own virtue); and this (the second braisa) is in agreement with the one who said [that the division was] in accordance with [the number of] those who entered the Land.

If you like you may say: Both statements [are in agreement with the view that the division was] in accordance with [the number of] those who entered the Land and [yet] there is no difficulty. The one [deals with the case of him] who was twenty years of age (and therefore, they were allotted portions by their own virtue); the other, with the case of he who was not [yet] twenty years of age. (119a)

The Mishna had stated: Since he was a firstborn son [who] takes two shares.

The Gemora asks: But why? [Surely the portion of Chepher] were [only] prospective, and a firstborn son is not [entitled] to take [a double share] in the prospective [property of his father] as in that which is in [his father's] possession [at the time of death]?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: [The double share was] in tent stakes (and other movable property – items that were in his possession).

Rabbah raised an objection: [It has been taught that] Rabbi Yehudah said: the daughters of Tzelophchad took four portions, for it is said: and there fell ten parts to Menasheh!

Rather, said Rabbah, the Land of Israel [was regarded even before the conquest as] in [actual] possession [of those who came out of Egypt].

An objection was raised: Rabbi Chidka said: Shimon of Shikmonite was my companion among the disciples of Rabbi Akiva. And thus did Rabbi Shimon of Shikmonite say: Moshe our Master knew that the daughters of Tzelophchad were to be inheritors, but he did not know whether or not they were to take the portion of the firstborn. And it was fitting that the [Scriptural] section of the laws of succession should have been written through Moshe, but the daughters of

Tzelophchad merited it, and it was written through them. Moshe, furthermore, knew that the man who gathered sticks [on Shabbos] was to be put to death, for it is said: Everyone that desecrates it shall surely be put to death, but he did not know by which [kind of] death he was to die. And it was fitting that the section of the man who gathered sticks should have been written through Moshe, only the gatherer had brought guilt upon himself and it was written through him. This teaches you that merit is brought about by means of the meritorious and punishment for guilt by means of the guilty. Now, if it be assumed [that] the Land of Israel was [regarded as being even before the conquest] in the possession [of those who came out of Egypt], why was he in doubt?

The Gemora answers: He was in doubt on this very [question] (whether the Land of Israel was regarded even before the conquest as in actual possession of those who came out of Egypt).

It is written: and I will give it you for a heritage, I am the Lord: [does this mean] it is for you an inheritance from your fathers, or perhaps [it means] that they would bequeath it but would not [themselves] be inheritors? And it was made clear to him [by God that the text implies] both: It is an inheritance for you from your fathers; yet you would [only] bequeath, and not [yourselves] inherit [it].

And this accounts for the Scriptural text: You bring them in, and implant them in the mountain of Your heritage. It is not written: 'You bring us in,' but 'You bring them in'; this teaches that they prophesied and did not know what they prophesied. (119a – 119b)

And they stood before Moshe and before Elozar the Kohen and before the leaders and all the congregation. Is it possible that they stood before Moshe etc. and they did not say anything to them [so that] they [had] to stand before the leaders and all the congregation? Rather, the verse is to be read as if it was reversed and expounded; these are the words of Rabbi Yoshyah. Abba Chanan said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: They were sitting in the house of study and these came and stood before all of them.

Wherein lies their dispute? [One] master is of the opinion [that] honor may be shown to a disciple in the presence of his teacher, and the other is of the opinion that it is not to be shown.

The Gemora rules: And the law is [that honor is] to be shown. And the law is [that honor is] not he shown.

The Gemora asks: Surely this is a contradiction between one law and the other!?

The Gemora answers: There is no contradiction: The one [refers to the case] where his teacher shows him respect; the other, where his teacher does not. (119b)

It was taught: The daughters of Tzelophchad were wise women, they were expounders (of the Torah), they were virtuous.

They [must] have been wise, since they spoke at an opportune moment; for Rav Shmuel son of Rav Yitzchak said: [Scripture] teaches that Moshe our master was sitting and holding forth an exposition on the section of yibum [levirate marriages], as it is said: If brethren dwell together. They said to him: If we are



[to be as good] as sons (since the existence of a daughter, like that of a son, exempts the mother from yibum), give us an inheritance as [to] a son; if not, let our mother be subject to the law of yibum!? And Moshe, immediately brought their cause before Hashem.

They [must] have been expounders, for they said: If he had a son we would not have spoken.

The Gemora asks: But was it not taught: a daughter?

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: Delete 'daughter' from here.

Abaye said: [The explanation is that they said]: 'Even if a son [of his] had a daughter, we would not have spoken.

They were virtuous, since they were married to such men only as were worthy of them. (119b)

DAILY MASHAL

Who Is Poorest of All?

Gabaim of charitable organizations are familiar with the story of some collectors who came to a wealthy man to request a donation for a worthy cause. He agreed, providing they reveal the name of the needy person for whom they were collecting but, true to their profession, they refused. "We're telling nothing", they replied, "If you refuse to contribute, Hashem will give someone else the mitzvah."

"If so", said the rich man, "I see that you know how to keep a secret. The truth is that I, too, need you to

collect for me, but without revealing my condition to a soul."

Rabbi Shlomo Heiman zt"l thus explained our Gemara's intention: "Poverty is difficult within a person's home." Some of the poor beg in public and their situation is therefore not so bad. Others, though, are stricken by poverty, as it were, only at home and are ashamed to disclose its existence outside and their situation is truly awful (*Chidushei Rabbi Shlomo*, II).