



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Bava Basra Daf Kuf Yud Ches

- **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if you say that EY was divided based on the people who left Mitzrayim, we can understand the pasuk that says, "larav tarbeh nachalaso v'lamat tamit nachalaso" – this would mean that a family that had a lot of people leaving Mitzrayim would receive a larger portion, no matter how many of that family were actually entering EY. However, according to the view that EY was divided based on the people entering EY, how would we explain this pasuk!? The Gemara says this remains a KASHYEH.
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if you say that EY was divided based on the people who left Mitzrayim, we can understand the claim of the daughters of Tzelafchad (their father had left Mitzrayim and was therefore entitled to a portion). However, according to the view that EY was divided based on the people entering EY, why would they claim that he deserved a portion if he was not from the people who entered EY!? **A:** According to that view we must say that their claim was that the portions would be "reverse inherited" (see earlier Gemara) to their grandfather Cheifer, and that they should then receive the portion that their father deserved from Cheifer.
- **Q: R' Pappa** asked, if you say that EY was divided based on the people who left Mitzrayim, we can understand the claim of Shevet Yosef, who said that they had increased tremendously in number and therefore needed a larger portion than they were otherwise entitled to get. However, according to the view that EY was divided based on the people entering EY, they would be receiving a portion based on their current size, so why did they need to complain? **A:** They were saying that they had a lot of children that were not yet 20 years old, and therefore wanted a larger portion to deal with the growth in the near future.
  - **Abaye** said, based on the fact that the pesukim tell us that the daughters of Tzelafchad, and Shevet Yosef made claims for more portions, it must be that there was not one other person who entered EY without getting a portion of the land. You can't say that there were more complaints, but the Torah only mentions the successful complaints, because the complaint of Shevet Yosef was not successful.
    - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that there were other unsuccessful complaints that are not recorded in the pesukim, and the reason the complaint of Yosef is mentioned is to teach that one should be careful from ayin harah. We learn this from Yehoshua's reply to Shevet Yosef. He told them "if you are a large group, go up to the forest". This should be understood to mean that Yehoshua told them, "go hide in the forest so that you not be the subject of an ayin harah". They responded to him, "we are from Shevet Yosef, over whom ayin harah has no power" (as can be learned from pesukim).
- The Braisa quoted earlier said that the portions of the meraglim were given to Yehoshua and Kalev. **Ulla** explains, we learn this from the pasuk that says that Yehoshua and Kalev "chayu min ha'anashim haheim". Now, this can't mean to teach that they were the only ones who remained alive, because another pasuk already says that. Rather, it means that they lived in the portions of the meraglim.
- The Braisa also said that the complainers and the people associated with Korach had no portion in EY.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the portions of the meraglim, of the complainers, and of the people of Korach were all given to Yehoshua and Kalev!? **A:** The first Braisa compares the complainers to the people of Korach (and says that they simply did not even get portions in EY) and this Braisa compares the complainers to the meraglim, and says that their portions were given to Yehoshua and Kalev.

- This can be seen in a Braisa. The Braisa says regarding the conversation of the daughters of Tzelafchad, the pasuk says “our father died in the Midbar” – this refers to Tzelafchad, “v’hu lo haya b’soch ha’eidah” – this refers to the meraglim, “hanoadim ahl Hashem” – this refers to the complainers, “ba’adas Korach” – refers to the people of Korach. Based on this pasuk, one Braisa compares the complainers to the meraglim, and the other compares them to the people of Korach.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Abaye**, according to the view that Yehoshua and Kalvev got the portions of the complainers, can it be that they took all the portions of all the people who complained to Moshe in the Midbar, which would virtually mean that they got all of EY!? **A:** For this purpose, “the complainers” refers to the people who complained along with Korach, not at other points in time.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if you say that EY was divided based on the people who left Mitzrayim, we can understand the pasuk that says that there were ten portions that went to Shevet Menasheh – 6 portions for the 6 families of Menasheh who took portions in EY, and four portions for the daughters of Tzelafchad (one portion on behalf of Tzelafchad, and 2 more as Tzelafchad’s inheritance from Cheifer). However, according to the view that EY was divided based on the people entering EY, the daughters of Tzelafchad should have only gotten 2 portions (the double portion that their father deserved as an inheritance as a bechor from Cheifer (based on the reverse inheritance), but nothing for his own sake, because he did not enter EY)!? **A:** Even according to the first view they only deserved 3! Rather, we must say that Tzelafchad had a brother who died childless and his portion was given to them as well, making up the 4<sup>th</sup> portion. We can say a similar idea according to the second view, that he had 2 brothers who died childless, and they received those 2 additional portions, making for a total of 4 portions.
  - In fact, we see this in a Braisa, where **R’ Eliezer ben Yaakov** darshens a pasuk to teach that the daughters of Tzelafchad received a portion of their uncle in addition to the other portions that they received.
- **Q: R’ Pappa** asked **Abaye**, how does the pasuk get to a number of 10 portions for Menasheh? If we look to the individual portions of the children, there would be a lot more than 10. If we are only looking to the main families (before division among the children) there should only be six!? Why are the portions of the daughters of Tzelafchad counted separately along with the portions of the main families? **A:** The pasuk only meant to count the main families. It stated the portions of the daughters of Tzelafchad only to teach that they also received the double portion that their father was entitled to as the bechor. This teaches that EY was considered to be in possession of the people who left Mitzrayim (since a bechor only takes a double portion of something in possession of the estate at the time of death).
- The Braisa said, the children of the meraglim and of the complainers got portions based on their paternal and maternal grandfathers.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa says that they received portions of their own!? **A:** The first Braisa follows the view that EY was divided to those who left Mitzrayim (and these children were not 20 years old when the Yidden left Mitzrayim), and the second Braisa follows the view that EY was divided to the people who entered EY. **A2:** Both Braisos can follow the view that EY was divided to the people who entered EY. However, the first Braisa is discussing children who were not yet 20 years old when they entered EY, and the second Braisa is discussing children who were already 20 years old when they entered EY.