

**A** בס"ד

Intro

Today we will learn בע"ה of דף ק"ח בבא בתרא  
Some of the topics we will learn about include.

A continuation of the Machlokes regarding

חלוקת הארץ

Who was entitled to receive a portion in the land of Eretz Yisroel?

רבי יאשיה says

ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ

The land was divided only according to those who were already twenty when they left מצרים even though they did not enter Eretz Yisroel, and all those who did enter Eretz Yisroel received their portions as an inheritance from their ancestors who were twenty when they left מצרים.

רבי יונתן says

לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ

The land was divided only among those who were already twenty when they entered Eretz Yisroel, and they received their portions in their own right, not as an inheritance.

צלפחד

The צלפחד came before משה רבינו with a claim that they are entitled to inherit their deceased father's portion in Eretz Yisroel, and they were subsequently given four portions in the land of מנשה.

**B** בני יוסף

The member's of שבט יוסף came before יהושע with a claim that their portion was too small and not sufficient for the large number of people in their Shevet. However, they were not given any additional land for their claim.

מרגלים

יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם

The portions that were designated for the ten מרגלים, the spies, were given to יהושע and כלב and not to the descendants of the מרגלים.

The Machlokes regarding

מתלוננים שבעדת קרח

The portion's that were designated for the 250 protestors who died during the incident of קרח;

Were these portions also given to יהושע and כלב, OR was the land absorbed by the other members of their Shevet?

**A**

## חלוקת הארץ

רבי יאשיה      רבי יונתן  
ליוצאי מצרים      לבאי הארץ  
נתחלקה הארץ      נתחלקה הארץ

## צלפחד

**B**

## בני יוסף

מרגלים  
יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם

## מתלוננים שבעדת קרח

1 So let's review ...  
The Gemara in the previous Daf discussed a Machlokes regarding חלוקת הארץ  
Who was entitled to a portion in the land of Eretz Yisroel?

רבי יאשיהו says  
ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ  
The land was divided only according to those who were already twenty when they left מצרים even though they did not enter Eretz Yisroel, and all those who entered Eretz Yisroel received their portions as an inheritance from their ancestors who left מצרים.

רבי יונתן says  
לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ  
The land was divided only among those who were already twenty when they entered Eretz Yisroel, and they received their portions in their own right, not as an inheritance.

The Gemara brings several proofs in support of רבי יאשיהו who holds  
ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ  
Four of which are alluded to in the סימן  
לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב

1.  
לרב  
The Pasuk states  
לרב תרבה נחלתו ולמעט תמעית נחלתו

This Pasuk can be understood according to the opinion of רבי יאשיהו  
Because as the Rashbam explains, the superfluous words לרב תרבה come to teach למי שהיה רב ביציאת מצרים  
תרבה נחלתו  
אע"פ שנתמעט בכניסתו לארץ  
A Shevet that was large when they left Mitzrayim gets a large portion, even though they were small when they actually entered Eretz Yisroel.

And the superfluous words למעט תמעית teach vice versa  
ולאותו שהיה מעט ביציאת מצרים  
תמעית גם עתה נחלתו  
אע"פ שנתרבה  
A Shevet that was small when they left Mitzrayim gets a small portion, even though they were large when they actually entered Eretz Yisroel. ®  
However, according to the opinion of רבי יאשיהו  
לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ  
Why does the Pasuk repeat these words?

And as the Rashbam explains, the Pasuk does not come to teach that  
לאותו שהוא רב עכשיו  
תרבה נחלתו  
ולמעט עכשיו  
תמעית נחלתו  
A Shevet that was large when entering Eretz Yisroel gets a large portion, and if small gets a small portion, because  
סברא הוא ולא צריך קרא  
This is self-understood and does not require a Pasuk

קשיא  
This question remains unanswered.  
=====

1 **חלוקת הארץ**  
*Who was entitled to a portion in Eretz Yisroel?*

רבי יאשיהו  
**ליוצאי מצרים**  
נתחלקה הארץ

רבי יונתן  
**לבאי הארץ**  
נתחלקה הארץ

Several proofs in support of רבי יאשיהו  
Four of which are alluded to in the סימן  
**לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב**

**לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב**

1  
**לרב תרבה נחלתו ולמעט תמעית נחלתו**

ולאותו שהיה מעט ביציאת מצרים תמעית גם עתה נחלתו אע"פ שנתרבה	רבי יאשיהו <b>ליוצאי מצרים</b> נתחלקה הארץ	למי שהיה רב ביציאת מצרים תרבה נחלתו אע"פ שנתמעט בכניסתו לארץ
---	--	--

**לרב תרבה נחלתו ולמעט תמעית נחלתו**

רבי יונתן  
**לבאי הארץ**  
נתחלקה הארץ

And as the Rashbam explains,  
the Pasuk does not come to teach that  
לאותו שהוא רב עכשיו תרבה נחלתו  
ולמעט עכשיו תמעית נחלתו  
A Shevet that was large when entering Eretz Yisroel gets a large portion, and if small gets a small portion,  
because  
סברא הוא ולא צריך קרא

**קשיא**

2

2. צלפחד

The **בנות צלפחד** came before **משה רבינו** and claimed that they are entitled to their deceased father's portion in Eretz Yisroel.

According to the opinion **ליוצאי מצרים** נתחלקה הארץ

**היינו דקא צווחן** בנות צלפחד

The **בנות צלפחד** had a valid claim, because their father was **מצרים** twenty years old when he left and was therefore entitled to a portion.

However, according to the opinion **לבאי הארץ** נתחלקה הארץ

**אמאי צווחן**, הא ליתיה דלשקול

**צלפחד's daughter's** did not have a valid claim, because neither their father **צלפחד** nor their grandfather **חפר** entered Eretz Yisroel and they were not entitled to a portion?

The Gemara answers

אלא לחזרה

וליטול בנכסי חפר

As the Gemara in the previous Daf explained, once the **באי הארץ** received their portion, it was returned to their ancestor who was **מיוצאי מצרים**, and then distributed equally among all his descendants, even those who were not **באי הארץ**.

Therefore, the **בנות צלפחד** had a valid claim to the portion that was first given to **צלפחד's brothers** who were **מבאי הארץ**, which was then returned to their father **חפר**, and then distributed among all his sons including **צלפחד**.

=====

2

**לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב**

2

**בנות צלפחד**

came before **משה רבינו** and claimed that they are entitled to their deceased father's portion in Eretz Yisroel.

**רבי יונתן**  
**לבאי הארץ**  
**נתחלקה הארץ**

**רבי יאליב**  
**ליוצאי מצרים**  
**נתחלקה הארץ**

?

**אמאי צווחן**  
**הא ליתיה דלשקול**

**צלפחד's daughter's** did not have a valid claim, because neither their father **צלפחד** nor their grandfather **חפר** entered Eretz Yisroel and they were not entitled to a portion?

**היינו דקא צווחן**  
**בנות צלפחד**

The **בנות צלפחד** had a valid claim, because their father was **מצרים** twenty years old when he left and was therefore entitled to a portion.

**אלא לחזרה**  
**וליטול בנכסי חפר**

Once the **באי הארץ** received their portion, it was returned to their ancestor who was **מיוצאי מצרים**, and then distributed equally among all his descendants, even those who were not **באי הארץ**.

Therefore, the **בנות צלפחד** had a valid claim to the portion that was first given to **צלפחד's brothers** who were **מבאי הארץ**, which was then returned to their father **חפר**, and then distributed among all his sons including **צלפחד**.



3

3. ויוסף

The people of יוסף came before יהושע with a claim that their portion was too small and insufficient for the large number of people in their Shevet.

According to the opinion ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ

היינו דקא צווחן בני יוסף The members of יוסף made a valid claim, because when they left מצרים their numbers were small, but when they entered Eretz Yisroel their numbers had increased tremendously, and their portion, which was given as per the יוצאי מצרים, was not sufficient for all those who actually entered Eretz Yisroel.

However, according to the opinion לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ

מאי קא צווחי, כולהו שקול יוסף had no claim, because they did receive a large portion, as per all those who entered Eretz Yisroel?

The Gemara answers משום טפלים דהוו נפישו להו יוסף made a claim for the large number of orphans who were younger than twenty years and were not entitled to a portion through their own right, and they were not entitled to a portion through inheritance, because their fathers were not מבאי הארץ, and their grandfathers who were יוצאי מצרים did not receive any portions from their descendants through חזרה.

We'll come back to the fourth סימן איכפל In which the Gemara digresses to a related topic;

3

### לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב

3

The people of יוסף came before יהושע with a claim that their portion was too small and insufficient for the large number of people in their Shevet.

רבי יונתן לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ

רבי יאליב ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ

מאי קא צווחי כולהו שקול

יוסף had no claim, because they did receive a large portion, as per all those who entered Eretz Yisroel?

היינו דקא צווחן בני יוסף

When they entered Eretz Yisroel their numbers had increased dramatically, but their portion given as per the יוצאי מצרים was not sufficient for all those who actually entered Eretz Yisroel.

### משום טפלים דהוו נפישו להו

יוסף made a claim for the large number of orphans...

...who were younger than twenty years and were not entitled to a portion through their own right,

...were not entitled to a portion through inheritance, because their fathers were not מבאי הארץ,

...and their grandfathers who were from יוצאי מצרים did not receive any portions from their descendants through חזרה.

לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב We'll come back and discuss the fourth סימן later



4

5.  
מנשה

The Pasuk in יהושע states  
ויפלו חבלי מנשה עשרה  
received ten portions in Eretz Yisroel;  
שיתא דשיתא בתי אבות  
וארבעה דידהו  
הא עשרה  
Six portions for the families of מנשה's six grandchildren  
and their descendants, and four portions for the צלפחד  
in all ten portions:

Now, according to the opinion  
ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ  
The צלפחד were entitled to four portions as follows;

1.  
נחלת אביהן  
Their father צלפחד's portion, as he was מצרים.
2.  
נחלת אבי אביהן  
Their grandfather חפר's portion who also was מצרים,  
and when he died his portion was divided among צלפחד  
and his brothers, and צלפחד's portion was then inherited  
by his daughters.
3.  
חלק בכורה  
Their father, צלפחד, was a firstborn son to his father חפר,  
and he therefore inherited a double share in his father  
חפר's portion.
4.  
חד אחא דאבא הוה להו  
צלפחד had one brother who died with no children and was  
entitled to a share in חפר's portion, and this share was  
divided between צלפחד and his brothers, which was then  
passed down to צלפחד's daughters.

However, according to the opinion  
לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ  
The צלפחד were not entitled to a portion through their  
father צלפחד, because he did not enter Eretz Yisroel?

The Gemara answers that according to this opinion we  
must say  
תרי אחי דאבא הוה להו  
צלפחד had two brothers who died with no children, and  
they were entitled to a share in חפר's portion, which חפר  
got through הזרה.  
Part of these two portions were inherited by the צלפחד  
together with the other two portions that צלפחד received  
בנכסי חפר.  
=====

4

לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב

5

ויפלו חבלי מנשה עשרה  
received ten portions in Eretz Yisroel;  
שיתא דשיתא בתי אבות  
וארבעה דידהו  
הא עשרה

Six portions for the families of מנשה's six grandchildren  
and their descendants, and four portions for the צלפחד

רבי יונתן  
לבאי הארץ  
נתחלקה הארץ

?

The צלפחד were not  
entitled to a portion  
through their father,  
because he did not enter  
Eretz Yisroel?

תרי אחי דאבא  
הוה להו  
צלפחד had two brothers  
who died with no children,  
and they were entitled to a  
share in חפר's portion,  
which חפר got through הזרה.

רבי יאליב  
ליוצאי מצרים  
נתחלקה הארץ

The צלפחד were entitled  
to four portions as follows;

1. נחלת אביהן.  
יוצאי מצרים אביהן צלפחד's portion, as a מצרים.
2. נחלת אבי אביהן.  
חפר's portion who also was  
מיוצאי מצרים, and when he died  
his portion was divided among  
צלפחד and his brothers.
3. חלק בכורה.  
צלפחד, was a firstborn and he  
therefore got a double share.
4. חד אחא דאבא הוה להו.  
צלפחד had one brother who  
died with no children.

5

6. יחשב  
The Gemara point out that even though בתי אבות קא חשיב  
The Pasuk enumerates only the six main families on the level of חפר; the six sons of גלעד, who were the grandchildren of מנשה;  
The Pasuk nevertheless mentions the four portions inherited by the בנות צלפחד, to teach that which the Gerara elaborates on in the next Daf,  
ארץ ישראל מוחזקת היא  
=====

5

לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב

6

The Gemara point out that even though **בתי אבות קא חשיב**  
The Pasuk enumerates only the six main families on the level of חפר; the six sons of גלעד, who were the grandchildren of מנשה;  
The Pasuk nevertheless mentions the four portions inherited by the בנות צלפחד, to teach that **ארץ ישראל מוחזקת היא**

6

The Braisa in the previous Daf continues: מרגלים יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם  
The portions that were designated for the ten מרגלים, the spies, were given to יהושע and כלב but not to the descendants of the מרגלים, as the Pasuk states ויהושע בן נון וכלב בן יפנה חיו מן האנשים ההם

The word חיו is not understood literally חיו ממש, that they remained alive, because this is already known from another Pasuk ולא נותר מהם איש כי אם כלב בן יפונה ויהושע בן נון

Therefore, we must say מאי חיו שחיו בחלקם יהושע and כלב sustained themselves from the portions of the מרגלים.

The Braisa continues מתלוננים ועדת קרה לא היה להם חלק בארץ  
The portion's that were designated for the 250 protestors who died during the incident of קרה were forfeited, and the land was absorbed by the other members of their Shevet.

The Gemara asks from a contradicting Braisa והתניא מרגלים מתלוננים ועדת קרה יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם  
The portions of both the מרגלים, and also the מתלוננים, were given to יהושע and כלב?

6

בריישא

מרגלים יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם

The portions that were designated for the ten מרגלים, were given to יהושע and כלב but not to the descendants of the מרגלים, as the Pasuk states

ויהושע בן נון וכלב בן יפנה חיו מן האנשים ההם

מאי חיו לחיו בחלקם יהושע and כלב sustained themselves from the portions of the מרגלים.

והתניא מרגלים מתלוננים ועדת קרה יהושע וכלב נטלו חלקם

The portions of both the מרגלים, and the מתלוננים, were given to יהושע and כלב?

מתלוננים ועדת קרה לא היה להם חלק בארץ

The portion's that were designated for the 250 protestors who died during the incident of קרה were forfeited, and was absorbed by the other members of their Shevet.

7 The Gemara explains that this is actually a Machlokes which is based on the Pasuk that refers to the claim of the בנות צלפחד:

אבינו מת במדבר  
והוא לא היה בתוך העדה הנועדים על ה' בעדת קרה  
כי בחטאו מת

אבינו מת במדבר  
Refers to צלפחד

והוא לא היה בתוך העדה  
Refers to the עדת מרגלים

הנועדים על ה' בעדת קרה  
Refers to the מתלוננים of קרה

The צלפחד was not part of any of these groups who were not entitled to a portion in Eretz Yisroel.

מור מוקיש מתלוננים למרגלים  
The second Braisa compares the מתלוננים to the מרגלים in that both portions were given to them.  
ומר לא מוקיש מתלוננים למרגלים  
The first Braisa does not compare them, and only the portions of the מרגלים were given to them, but not the portion of the מתלוננים.

7 This is a Machlokes based on the Pasuk that refers to the claim of the בנות צלפחד:

אבינו מת במדבר  
והוא לא היה בתוך העדה  
הנועדים על ה' בעדת קרה  
כי בחטאו מת

Their father צלפחד was not part of any of these groups who were not entitled to a portion in Eretz Yisroel.

ומר לא מוקיש  
מתלוננים  
למרגלים

The first Braisa does not compare them, and only the portions of the מרגלים were given to יהושע וכלב.

מור מוקיש  
מתלוננים  
למרגלים

The second Braisa compares the מתלוננים to the מרגלים in that both portions were given to יהושע וכלב.

8 We now return to the fourth סימן:

4.  
איכפל  
The Gemara points out that according to the opinion מוקיש מתלוננים למרגלים  
The term מתלוננים refers only to the מתלוננים שבעדת קרה  
But not to other מתלוננים;  
Because, if it did,  
איכפול יהושע וכלב וירתו לכולה א"י  
would have gotten most of Eretz Yisroel?  
=====

8 לרב צלפחד ויוסף איכפל מנשה יחשב

4

The Gemara points out that according to the opinion

מוקיש מתלוננים למרגלים

The term מתלוננים refers only to the

מתלוננים שבעדת קרה

But not to other מתלוננים;

Because, if it did,

איכפול יהושע וכלב וירתו לכולה א"י  
would have gotten most of Eretz Yisroel?

9 The Braisa concludes  
 הבנים נטלו  
 בזכות אבי אביהן ובזכות אבי אמותיהן  
 The sons of the מתאוננים only received portions that they  
 inherited from their paternal or maternal grandfathers, but  
 not from their own fathers.

The Gemara asks from a contradicting Braisa  
 התניא בזכות עצמן  
 The sons received portions through their own right?

The Gemara offers two answers:

1.  
 Either the two Breisos are a Machlokes and  
 הא כמאן דאמר ליוצאי מצרים  
 הא כמאן דאמר לבאי הארץ  
 The first Braisa holds  
 ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ  
 While the second Braisa holds  
 לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ

2.  
 OR there is no Machlokes, and both Breisos hold  
 לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ  
 And

הא דהוה בן עשרים  
 הא דלא הוה בן עשרים  
 The second Braisa refers to sons who were already twenty  
 when they entered Eretz Yisroel. Therefore,  
 נטלו בזכות עצמן

The first Braisa refers to sons who were younger than  
 twenty when they entered Eretz Yisroel. Therefore,  
 לא נטלו בזכות עצמן  
 And as the Rashbam explains,  
 בבני בני מתלוננים קמיירי  
 This Braisa must refer to the grandsons of the מתלוננים, but  
 it cannot refer to the sons of the מתלוננים, because the  
 incident of קרח occurred in the second year the Yidden  
 were in the מדבר, and the sons of the מתלוננים would have  
 to be at least thirty eight years old when they entered  
 Eretz Yisroel.

9 The Braisa concludes  
 הבנים נטלו  
**בזכות אבי אביהן ובזכות אבי אמותיהן**  
 The sons of the מתאוננים only received portions  
 they inherited from their paternal or maternal grandfathers,  
 but not from their own fathers.



והתניא בזכות עצמן

1

The two Breisos are a Machlokes

הא כמאן דאמר  
 לבאי הארץ

The second Braisa holds  
 לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ

הא כמאן דאמר  
 ליוצאי מצרים

The first Braisa holds  
 ליוצאי מצרים נתחלקה הארץ

2

there is no Machlokes, and both Breisos hold  
**לבאי הארץ נתחלקה הארץ**

הא דהוה  
 בן עשרים

The second Braisa  
 refers to sons who were  
 already twenty when  
 they entered Eretz  
 Yisroel. Therefore,  
 נטלו בזכות עצמן

הא דלא הוה  
 בן עשרים

The first Braisa  
 refers to sons who were  
 younger than twenty when  
 they entered Eretz Yisroel.  
 Therefore,  
 לא נטלו בזכות עצמן

And as the Rashbam explains,  
 בבני בני מתלוננים קמיירי

This Braisa must refer to the grandsons of the מתלוננים,  
 but not to the sons of the מתלוננים,  
 because the incident of קרח occurred in the second year  
 the Yidden were in the מדבר, and the sons of the מתלוננים  
 would have to be at least thirty eight years old  
 when they entered Eretz Yisroel.