



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Burying the dead and accompanying a bride

The braisa says that one should bury the dead and accompany a bride who is getting married, even if it means he must stop learning Torah. They related that Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rabbi Ila'i would stop learning to bury the dead and accompany a bride. The braisa explains that this is only when there aren't enough already involved, but if there are enough, one should not stop learning Torah to participate.

The Gemora asks how much is considered enough for a burial, and gives the following opinions:

1. Rav Shmuel bar Inia cites Rav saying 12000 people and 6000 people announcing the funeral with shofars (or 6000 of them announcing).
2. Ulla says it is enough people to reach from the gate of the city to the cemetery.
3. Rav Sheishes says 600,000, for the Torah of the departed must be returned with as many people as when it was given.

These numbers are only for someone who learned verses and Mishnayos, but if someone taught others Torah, there is no limit as to how many people must be involved.

The Divine Presence in exile

The Gemora cites a braisa in which Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai says that we can see how beloved Bnai Yisrael are from the fact that Hashem's presence always stays with them. When they were in Egypt, His presence was with them, as the verse says that Hashem revealed himself to the ancestors of kohanim in Egypt. When they were exiled to Babylonia, His presence went with them, as the verse says: "I have [been] sent to Babylonia for your sake." In the future, when Hashem will redeem them, His presence will be with them, as the verse says that Hashem will *shav* – return your exile, using the word *shav* – return and not the word *haishiv* – bring back, as if Hashem himself will return.

The Gemora asks: Where in Babylonia is His presence?

Abaye answers that it is in the shul of Hutzel and in the shul of *shaf v'yasiv* – destroyed and resettled in Nehard'a. The Gemora explains that it isn't in both places simultaneously, but rather it alternates between them.

Abaye says that he should be rewarded since he makes it a point to go to these places, even when it's up to a parsah out of his way.

Shmuel's father and Levi were once sitting in the shaf v'yasiv shul in Nehard'a, and the divine presence came. They heard a loud noise, and they got up and left. Rav Sheishes was once there, and also heard such a sound, but he stayed. Angels came and tried to scare him into leaving. He asked Hashem why he should leave, as it's proper for Hashem, who is never insulted, to defer to Rav Sheshes, who is a human who can get insulted, and Hashem told the angels to leave him alone.

Rabbi Yitzchak says that the verse which says that Hashem will be for Bnai Yisrael as a mini [Bais ha] mikdash refers to synagogues and study halls in Babylonia, while Rabbi Elozar says that it refers to Rav's house in Babylonia.

Rava says that the verse which says that Hashem has been a shelter for us in each generation refers to synagogues and study halls in the exile.

Abaye says that originally he would learn Torah at home and pray in a synagogue, but when he encountered the verse in Tehillim which says "Hashem, I like the shelter of Your house," he would also learn in a synagogue.

The Gemora cites a braisa in which Rabbi Elazar haKapar says that, in the future, synagogues and study halls in Babylonia will be established in Eretz Yisrael, as the verse says that Mt. Carmel and Mt.

Tavor came to Mt. Sinai for the giving of the Torah. If these mountains, which temporarily came to learn Torah, were established in Eretz Yisrael, certainly these places, in which Torah is read and taught in public, will certainly be established.

Bar Kapara explains that the verse which asks why "these gavnunim mountains are agitated" refers to a heavenly voice which told these mountains that they have no complaint against the choice of Mt. Sinai for the giving of the Torah, as they are all considered blemished, as one blemish is giben (like gavnunim). Rav Ashi says that we see from here that one who is haughty is considered blemished.

Shortcut through a synagogue

The Mishna said that one may not make a synagogue a kapandarya. Rava explains that this means one may not use it as a shortcut, as kapandarya is a contraction of *admakifna adarai – instead of my going around the rows of houses, ai'ol beha – I will enter here*. Rabbi Avahu says one may use it for a shortcut if there was originally a path through it. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that if one entered not for a shortcut, he may use it as a shortcut (i.e., exit in a different door). Rabbi Chelbo cites Rav Huna saying that if one entered a synagogue to pray, he may use it as a shortcut, as the verse about the Bais Hamikdash says that when one would enter from the north, they would exit in the south.

Uprooting vegetation

The Mishna said that if vegetation grew in a destroyed synagogue, one may not uproot them, to



cause anguish. The Gemora cites a braisa that says that one may not uproot them to feed his animal, but my uproot them and leave them, and says that the Mishna is also referring to uprooting them to feed his animal.

The Gemora cites a braisa which lists prohibitions in a cemetery. One may not be light-headed, one may not graze animals, one may not run an irrigation ditch through it, and one may not uproot vegetation, and if one did uproot it, he must burn it in place, in order to honor the dead. The Gemora explains that the conclusion of the braisa which gives the goal of honoring the dead, refers to the prohibition on being light-headed there.

4 Portions

The Mishna says that if Rosh Chodesh Adar is on Shabbos, we read Shkalim then, but if it is during the week, we read the Shabbos before, and skip the next one. On the second Shabbos, we read Zachor, on the third, we read Parah, and on the fourth Hachodesh, and on the fifth we return to the regular order. We interrupt the regular order for Rosh Chodesh, Chanuka, Purim, communal fasts, ma'amados, and Yom Kippur.

Shkalim

The Gemora cites the Mishna which says that on the first of Adar they announce the collection of Shkalim and uprooting of kila'im.

The Gemora says that kila'im is logical for that time, since that is the time that vegetation grows, but why do they announce the collection of shkalim?

Rabbi Ravi cites Rabbi Yoshiya saying that the verse teaches that on Nisan we must start bringing the communal sacrifices from the new collection. We therefore announce the collection at the start of Adar to give people time to bring their shkalim in time for the first of Adar.

The Gemora suggests that this isn't consistent with Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, who says that we start discussing the laws of Pesach only two weeks before Pesach, as he would say we announce only 2 weeks before Pesach.

The Gemora says that it can be consistent with this position, as they only set up formal collection tables on the 15th of Adar, 2 weeks before Nisan.

Reading for shkalim

The Gemora cites a dispute about what we read for Shkalim. Rav says we read the portion about the tamid offering, while Shmuel says we read ki sisa, which describes collecting the half shekel from Bnai Yisrael.

The Gemora says that we understand why ki sisa is called shkalim, since it mentions the half shekel, but why would the tamid portion be called Shkalim?

The Gemora answers with Rabbi Tavi's statement that the communal sacrifices, like the tamid, had to be brought from the new shkalim, making the tamid relevant to collecting shkalim.



The Gemora then says that we understand the reading of the tamid, as it refers to a sacrifice, which was the reason for collecting yearly shkalim, but why would we read ki sisa, as it refers to the shkalim collected for the construction of the mishkan, not for sacrifices?

The Gemora answers with Rav Yosef's statement that the three mentions of the word *terumah* – collection in ki sisa refer to three funds: the fund for the sockets used in the mishkan, the fund for sacrifices, and the maintenance fund.

The Gemora asks how this Rosh Chodesh's reading is different, if we read tamid, which is in the same section as every Rosh Chodesh's reading?

The Gemora answers that on a regular Rosh Chodesh on Shabbos, we would read 6 aliyos in the regular portion, and one of Rosh Chodesh, but on shkalim, we only read Rosh Chodesh.

The Gemora challenges this, as this is only according to the one who says that we interrupt the regular reading for the 4 portions, but not according to the one who says that we only interrupt the regular haftaros.

The Gemora answers that if we read the regular portion, shkalim is still different, as we read 3 aliyos from the regular portion, and 4 from tamid.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which says the haftara for shkalim is the story of

Yehoyada's new system of maintenance fund donations, which is related to ki sisa.

The Gemora answers that is also related to tamid, based on Rabbi Tavi's statement about the requirement to offer the sacrifices from the new shekel collection.

The Gemora challenges Rav from a braisa which says that if shkalim falls out on the weekly portion directly preceding or following it, they read shkalim two weeks in a row. The weekly schedule of portions around the season of shkalim includes ki sisa, but not tamid, which is in Pinchas.

The Gemora deflects this by saying that the braisa may refer to those in Eretz Yisrael who would complete the Torah in a triennial cycle, making it possible for Pinchas to be read around shkalim time.

The Gemora cites a braisa supporting Shmuel. The braisa says that if Rosh Chodesh Adar is on Shabbos, we read ki sisa and the haftara about Yehoyada.

3 Torahs

Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha says that if Rosh Chodesh Adar is on Shabbos, we take out 3 Torah scrolls – one for the regular portion, one for Rosh Chodesh reading, and one for ki sisa. He also says that if Rosh Chodesh Teves (which is on Chanuka) is on Shabbos, we take out 3 Torah scrolls – one for the regular portion, one for Rosh Chodesh reading, and one for Chanuka reading. The Gemora explains that

if he would have just taught the ruling about Rosh Chodesh Teves, we may have thought that he rules like Rav about what we read for shkalim. Once he taught the ruling about Rosh Chodesh Adar, we inferred the ruling about Rosh Chodesh Teves.

Rosh Chodesh Teves

The Gemora cites a dispute about the reading for Rosh Chodesh Teves that falls during the week. Rav Yitzchak Nafcha says that 3 read the Rosh Chodesh reading, and one reads the Chanuka reading, while Rav Dimi from Chaifa says that 3 read the Chanuka reading, and one reads the Rosh Chodesh reading. Rabbi Mani says that Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha's position is more logical, as we always start with the more common of two items. Rabbi Avin says that Rav Dimi's position is more logical, since Rosh Chodesh is the reason for reading 4 aliyos, so it should be the one to be read 4th.

The Gemora asks what the final ruling is. Rav Yosef says we deemphasize Rosh Chodesh, Rabba says we deemphasize Chanuka, and the Gemora rules that we deemphasize Chanuka, reading it last.

Shkalim and the weekly portion

The Gemora discusses what we read when shkalim falls out on the portion of teztaveh (which precedes ki sisa). Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha says we read 6 aliyos of teztaveh, and one (for shkalim) of ki sisa.

Abaye challenges this, as people will think that all of the reading is the weekly portion, since they are read contiguously.

Rather, Abaye says that we read 6 aliyos all the way until the end of shkalim, and then for the 7th aliyah we re-read the ki sisa portion for shkalim.

The Gemora challenges Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha from a braisa which says that if shkalim falls out on a preceding or following portion, we read and repeat it, implying that we read ki sisa twice.

Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha notes that even according to Abaye we must explain how we repeat when it falls on the following portion by saying that we read ki sisa two weeks in a row. Similarly, he can explain the braisa to mean that when it falls on the preceding portion, we read ki sisa two weeks in a row.

The Gemora discusses what we read when shkalim falls out on the portion of ki sisa. Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha says we read 6 aliyos from after shkalim until the end of ki sisa, and then read shkalim for the 7th.

Abaye challenges this, as people will think they are just reading the weekly portion out of order, and therefore says we read the whole portion of ki sisa in 6 aliyos, and then repeat the start of ki sisa for shkalim in the 7th aliyah.

The Gemora cites a braisa which rules like Abaye's position.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

THE SMALL SANCTUARY

By Gil Student

The Talmud (Megillah 29a) expounds on the prophetic verse "I shall become to them a small sanctuary in the countries where they shall come" (Ezekiel 11:16) - that in the times of exile the synagogue is the equivalent of the Temple. Synagogues are not merely a post-exilic invention to facilitate communal prayer but, rather, are part of an historical continuum beginning with the Tabernacle built in the Desert, continuing with the two Temples in Jerusalem, and culminating with the third, messianic Temple. This equation bears clear and documented halakhic ramifications.

The Tosefta (Megillah 3:14) rules that a synagogue's doors must be opposite its ark as was done in the Tabernacle. This architectural law, based solely on the equation of a synagogue with the Desert era sanctuary, is cited by halakhic authorities throughout the ages. This is certainly an indication that the synagogue's designation as a "small sanctuary" is an halakhic mandate, particularly in regard to its architecture.

Similarly, the Mishnah (Megillah 3:3, 28a) states that a synagogue that is in ruins and unusable retains its sanctity because the Torah relates God's statement, "I will make your sanctuaries desolate" (Leviticus 26:31); even in destruction they are still

called sanctuaries. Thus, the status of synagogues as small sanctuaries has halakhic ramifications in terms of holiness, as documented in a Tannaitic halakhic passage. The medieval commentators expand on this as follows below.

The precise sanctity of a synagogue is explained by Nahmanides as being the same sanctity of any other item used for a *mitzvah*, such as a *sukkah* or *shofar*. This is a holiness that exists while the *mitzvah* is being performed. However, at times when a synagogue is neither in use nor set aside for a *mitzvah* it retains no sanctity. Rabbenu Nissim of Gerona (*Ran on Rif*, Megillah 8a) disputes this understanding at length and instead explains that synagogues are imbued with a holiness while certain key prayers are being recited and, for other times, the Sages decreed that a rabbinic sanctity be instilled into synagogues. R. Eliezer of Metz (*Yere'im*, 324), however, is of the view that synagogues always have a biblical sanctity similar to that of the Temple in Jerusalem and, therefore, the biblical obligation to fear the Temple (Leviticus 19:30) applies equally to synagogues. This is echoed by R. Moshe of Coucy (*Semag, aseh* 164) and R. Yitzhak of Corbille (*Semak*, 6). Significantly, commentators have deduced from Maimonides' words that he is of the same view. Certainly, according to R. Eliezer of Metz et al., the synagogue is halakhically and biblically a small sanctuary. Even according to Rabbenu Nissim the equation of synagogues and the Temple stands, albeit alternating between a biblical and a rabbinic level.



Only according to Nahmanides is the equation left on the aggadic level.

The Gemara (Megillah 28a-b) quotes the Tosefta (Megillah 2:11) that frivolity is prohibited in a synagogue. Many see the root of this prohibition as the holiness due to its status as a "small sanctuary." Just like we are obligated to fear the holy Temple, we are similarly required to act respectfully inside its exilic counterpart.

R. Mordekhai ben Hillel (Megillah, ch. 3 no. 827) writes that the biblical prohibition against tearing down parts of the Temple also applies to a synagogue because it is a "small sanctuary." This is agreed to by many of the scholars mentioned above and is brought down as practical *halakhah* by R. Moshe Isserles in his authoritative glosses to *Shulhan Arukh (Orah Hayim 152:1)*.

In an important responsum (no. 161), R. Yosef Colon (fifteenth century) contends that the Sages consistently equated synagogues with the Temple. In addition to the passage of "small sanctuary" and the Mishnah regarding a desolate synagogue, R. Colon cites Shabbos 11a where the law is stated that the synagogue must be the tallest building in a town. As a prooftext for this rule the Talmud quotes a verse in Ezra (9:9) regarding the building of the Temple – "To raise the house of our Lord." Evidently, the Talmud considers verses about the

Temple to be valid indicators about the proper architecture of the synagogue. R. Colon further cites the Mordekhai who extends this equation to the holiness of the Temple, as we saw above, and then extends the concept himself to equate donations to a synagogue with donations to the Temple.

Clearly, the idea of the synagogue having the status of the Temple is more than a mere homiletic device and has extensive halakhic applications. In the lands of exile our sole refuge of holiness from the mundane world is the synagogue, the sanctuary that accompanies us in our wanderings. All agree that the respect due to such a holy place demands that frivolity be prohibited in the synagogue much as it was in the Temple.

It is also noteworthy that the classical *peshat* commentaries to Ezekiel – Rashi, R. David Kimhi, R. Yosef Kara, Metzudat David, R. Yitzhak Abrabanel – all explain the phrase "I shall become to them a small sanctuary" (Ezekiel 11:16) as referring to synagogues in exile.