

**ואי אשמועינן בימות הגשמים כולי –**

**And if he would inform us regarding the rainy season, etc.**

### **OVERVIEW**

The גמרא explains that it is necessary for the משנה to mention רקק twice to teach us that a רקק is a רה"ר both in the rainy season and in the sunny season. The גמרא continues to explain why we could not derive the ימות החמה from the ימות הגשמים and vice versa. The משנה however never mentioned either תוספות or ימות הגשמים (it just mentioned רקק twice), which prompts to make the following observation.

-----  
**בצריכותא<sup>1</sup> חדא סגיא<sup>2</sup> –**

**One צריכותא would be sufficient** to explain why רקק is mentioned twice -

**דאי תנא חדא זימנא רקק הוה מוקמינא ליה בדדמי ליה<sup>3</sup> –**

**For if רקק would be mentioned only once we would have established this רקק for whichever is more appropriate for it -**

**להכי תנא תרי זימני רקק –**

**Therefore it was necessary for the משנה to mention רקק twice;** the reason the גמרא mentioned two צריכותות is -

**אלא כיון דמשכחת צריכותא עביד –**

**Only since the גמרא found a צריכותא for either way, the גמרא acted -**

**כאילו<sup>4</sup> תנא בברייתא<sup>5</sup> בהדיא רקק בימות החמה ורקק בימות הגשמים<sup>6</sup>:**

**As if the (ברייתא) [משנה] taught explicitly a בימות החמה and a רקק בימות הגשמים.**

### **SUMMARY**

---

<sup>1</sup> The צריכותא is the necessity to mention either case since it cannot be derived from the other.

<sup>2</sup> Let us assume that we can derive ימות החמה from ימות הגשמים, but we cannot derive ימות הגשמים from ימות החמה, for it is more logical that it should be a רה"ר in the ימות החמה (or the opposite) this one צריכותא would suffice to explain why the תנא wrote רקק twice, for if he wrote it only once I would assume that he is discussing only ימות החמה (for that is when it is more logical that it should be considered a רה"ר). Therefore it is necessary to mention רקק a second time to include even ימות הגשמים. [The opposite is equally true.] See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

<sup>3</sup> We would choose the one צריכותא that we feel is more appropriate and that will explain why רקק is mentioned twice (see previous footnote # 2).

<sup>4</sup> See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

<sup>5</sup> It is actually a משנה on ק,ב (see רש"י).

<sup>6</sup> Had the ברייתא stated explicitly בימות החמה ובימות הגשמים, both צריכותות would be necessary to explain why we cannot derive חמה from גשמים and גשמים from חמה.

One צריכותא is sufficient; he mentioned both because they were available and would explain the ברייתא had it mentioned ימות החמה and ימות הגשמים.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

1. Why cannot we say that the גמרא mentions both צריכותא (not because it considers as if the משנה mentioned both ימות החמה and ימות הגשמים<sup>7</sup>, but rather) because the גמרא was not sure which of these is more logically consistent; therefore it mentioned both, so whichever way you may think, it is still necessary to write רקק twice?

2. תוספות writes that one צריכותא would be sufficient.<sup>8</sup> This presents a difficulty. Let us assume that it is more logical that a רה"ר בימות רקק is a החמה. Why then does the תנא write רקק twice, when it could have written רקק רה"ר בימות הגשמים is a רה"ר and I would know that it is certainly a רה"ר בימות החמה?<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See footnote # 4.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote # 2.

<sup>9</sup> See תוספות הרא"ש.