

Is it written; 'the waters bubbled'!

מי כתיב מים נבעו –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא rejects the suggestion that מבעה (in the משנה) refers to מים; for in the פסוק of מים תבעה אש, the verb תבעה refers to the אש, but not to the מים.¹ If the verb was referring to מים, the פסוק would be written מים נבעו. It would seem that if the פסוק would state מים נבעו, we could suggest that מבעה refers to מים. Our תוספות questions this assumption.

תוספות asks:

ואם תאמר כי כתיב נמי נבעו לא מיתוקמא מתניתין במים -

And if you will say; even if it was written נבעו, nevertheless the משנה could not be referring to water when it states מבעה -

דמי קתני נבעה כדדייק לעיל (דף ג, ב) גבי שן² -

For does the גמרא infer (נבעה, not מבעה, the משנה writes נבעה) as the משנה read נבעה (the משנה writes נבעה, not מבעה) as the גמרא inferred previously regarding שן.

תוספות answers:

ויש לומר דלא שייך לאקשוויי אלא גבי שן דליתני נבעה שהשן עצמו נבעה -

And one can say; that this question (that the משנה should have stated נבעה) is only applicable by שן; that the משנה should have stated נבעה, since it is the tooth itself that is revealed (נבעה) -

דמבעה משמע מגלה [דבר אחר שהיה מכוסה] -

For the word מבעה (in the context of revealing) indicates that the מבעה is uncovering [something else which was covered] -

אבל במים שייך שפיר לישנא דמבעה שהמים רותחים קרויים מבעבעים:

However, regarding water the term מבעה (in the context of bubbling) is duly appropriate, for boiling water is referred to as מבעבעים (bubbling). The term מבעה refers to the boiling (bubbling) of the water itself; not that it causes others to boil (as opposed to the term מבעה, in the context of revealing, where it would mean to reveal others, rather than being revealed itself, and therefore מבעה cannot be referring to שן).³

¹ See רש"י ד"ה תבעה; 'the fire boils (or bubbles) the water'.

² The גמרא stated previously that שמואל disagrees with רב that מבעה refers to שן; for then the משנה should have stated נבעה (meaning it itself is revealed). Similarly here too if מבעה (in the משנה) refers to מים (and the פסוק would have stated מים נבעו), the משנה should have written נבעה referring to the water itself. If there is a similar difficulty with מים, as there is with שן, there is no advantage in suggesting that מבעה refers to מים. See previous ואימא.

³ The form of the word מבעה (generally) indicates that it is acting on others; however in the case of bubbling/boiling it can be referring to itself (a passive verb). נבעו – it is being boiled; מבעה – it is boiling.

SUMMARY

The term מבעה applies to the water itself; not its effect on others.

THINKING IT OVER

Is תוספות question according to either רב or שמואל or is it according to both of them?