



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

### Shavuos Daf Hey

- The Gemara earlier quoted a Braisa that said, how do we know that one is only chayuv a korbon for tumah if he was aware of the tumah before the aveira, was aware of it after the aveira, and was unaware at the time of the aveira? **R' Akiva** says we learn this from the fact that the pasuk says "v'nelam" twice. **Rebbi** says, we don't have to come onto darshening the extra word. Rather, from "v'nelam" (i.e. he was unaware) this means that he must have been aware beforehand. When the pasuk then says "v'hu yadah", this refers to a second awareness. The extra "v'nelam" teaches that one is also chayuv if he was aware that he was tamei, but was unaware that the place he went into was the Mikdash, or that the meat he ate was a korbon.
  - **Q:** How does the word "v'nelam" suggest that he was previously aware? **A:** **Rava** said, since the pasuk doesn't say "v'hi aluma" (it is concealed from him) and instead says "v'nelam", we can say that v'nelam means "he became unaware", which means that he was previously aware.
    - **Q:** **Abaye** asked, by sotah the pasuk says "v'nelam mei'einei ishah". According to what was just said this would mean that the husband was previously aware. However, this cannot be, because a Braisa says that if the husband was previously aware and then had bi'ah with his wife, the sotah waters process would no longer work!? Furthermore, a pasuk regarding the Torah says "v'ne'elma" from the eyes of all living creatures and birds. According to what was just said, this would mean that there is some creature which previously did know about it. However, that can't be, because a pasuk clearly says that "no man ever knew its extent"! **A:** Rather, **Abaye** said, **Rebbi** holds that "awareness" has been met if he knows that one who touches a sheretz becomes tamei, and that he knows that he touched a sheretz, even if he doesn't realize that he has now become tamei by having touched the sheretz.
      - **Q:** **R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, based on this, how will we explain the Mishna's case of where there was no awareness in the beginning? Every Yid learns as a child the concept of tumah!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the case would be where a Yid was raised among goyim, where he had no Torah upbringing.

### YETZI'OS SHABBOS SHTAYIM SHEHEIN ARBAH

- **Q:** The Mishna in Shabbos says there are "2 which are 4" for the one standing inside (the B"HB) and "2 which are 4" for the one standing outside. Why does our Mishna here only say there are "2 which are 4", and nothing more than that? **A:** In Shavuos, where the main discussion is not about Shabbos, we only mention the Avos Melachos (which are the melachos that were done in the Mishkan, and therefore encompasses taking from the reshus hayachid to the reshus harabim), but the Mishna in Shabbos, which is discussing Shabbos in depth, discusses the Avos and the Toldos (which therefore includes bringing from reshus harabim to reshus hayachid as well).
  - **Q:** Avos are only the cases of transferring from reshus hayachid to the reshus harabim, so how can our Mishna say there are "2 which are 4"? You can't say it means that there are 4 but only 2 of which are chayuv D'Oraisa, because the Mishna groups this case with the case of tzaraas, and over there all cases are chayuv D'Oraisa!? **A:** Rather, **R' Pappa** said, here in Shavuos we only list cases that carry a chiyuv D'Oraisa, and the two cases of transferring from the reshus harabim into the reshus hayachid are also chayuv D'Oraisa.
    - **Q:** The Mishna says "yetziyos", which means "removing" from the reshus hayachid, not bringing into it!? **A:** **R' Ashi** explains, anytime there is an akira on

something, it is called a “hotza’ah”, even if it is being brought *into* the reshus hayachid. In fact, we see this from a Mishna as well. **Rava** says, when the Mishna says “yetziyos”, it actually refers to “reshuyos” (domains). The Mishna means to say there are two domains for Shabbos – reshus harabim and reshus hayachid – which lead to 4 cases of chiyuv.

#### MAROS NEGA’IM SHNAYIM SHEHEIN ARBA’AH

- A Mishna says, the appearance of nega’im are two that are actually four – “baheres” is strong white, like snow; secondary to it is one that is white like the lime of the Heichal; “se’eis” is like white wool; secondary to it is white like the inner membrane of an egg. Each secondary (toldah) can combine with its primary (av) to meet the necessary size of a gris to create a negah of minimum size.
  - **Rava** said, this Mishna cannot follow **R’ Akiva**, who lists these 4 in the order of snow white, white wool, white like lime, and egg membrane, and says that each can combine with the one listed next to it to create the minimum size negah. Now, **R’ Akiva** can’t be the Tanna of the Mishna, because then the “white like lime” will not be able to combine with anything – it can’t combine with baheres, because s’eis is between them. It also can’t combine with se’eis, because it is not a toldah of se’eis! Therefore, the Tanna of the Mishna cannot be **R’ Akiva**.
    - **Q:** You should also say that according to **R’ Akiva** the white like the membrane of the egg can also not combine with anything – it can’t combine with se’eis, because white like lime is in between them, and it can’t combine with white like lime, because they are each a toldah of a different av!? **A:** The white like the membrane of an egg will always be able to combine with a se’eis, even though the white like lime is between them, based on the pasuk of “v’lase’eis v’lasapachas”. Therefore, the only difficulty with saying that the Mishna follows **R’ Akiva** is the case of white like lime.