



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

“All”

[The Gemora continues to demonstrate that the term ‘all’ is an inclusionary expression.]

The Gemora asks: And that which was taught that all are obligated to read the *Megillah*, and all are fit to read the *Megillah*, what are these meant to include?

The Gemora answers: They are meant to include women, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, for Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi ruled: It is obligatory for women to hear the reading of the *Megillah*, because they benefited also by the same miracle (*Haman’s decree to kill all the Jewish people included the women*).

The Gemora asks: And that which was taught that all may arrange a *zimmin* (*three or more people who ate together are under the obligation to say the Grace after Meals together and recite an extra blessing beforehand*), what is that meant to include?

The Gemora answers: It means to include women and slaves, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Women arrange a *zimmin* amongst themselves, and slaves arrange a *zimmin* amongst themselves. [Women and slaves cannot join a man in a *zimmin*; this is because there are statements in the second blessing regarding covenants (circumcision) and land that was given to our ancestors that do not apply to them.]

The Gemora asks: And that which it states in the *braisa* that all may be joined to a *zimmin*, what does ‘all’ include?

The Gemora answers: It includes a minor who knows to Whom one pronounces the blessing, for Rav Nachman said: One may arrange a *zimmin* with a minor who knows to Whom one pronounces the blessing.

The Gemora asks: And that which was taught in a *Mishna* that all become *tamei* through *zivah* (*a man who has an emission similar but not identical to a seminal discharge*), what does ‘all’ include?

The Gemora answers: That includes an infant one day old, for it was taught in a *braisa*: It could have said: *When a man*. Why does the text state ‘*a man, a man*’? That is to include an infant one day old, that he can become *tamei* through *zivah*; this is the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah. Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah says: This exposition is not necessary, for behold it is written: *And a person that has a discharge, whether it be a male or a female*. A male teaches me that any male can become *tamei*, whether he is a minor or adult. A female teaches me that any female can become *tamei*, whether she is a minor or adult. If so, why does the Torah say (*the redundant phrase*) *a man, a man*? The Torah speaks according to the language of people.

The Gemora asks: And that which was taught in a *braisa* that all are susceptible to become *tamei* through contact with someone who became *tamei* by a corpse, what does ‘all’ include?

The Gemora answers: That includes a minor, for although the verse states, *a man*, I might have thought that a minor does not contract corpse *tumah*, it is therefore written: *upon the living beings that were there*.

The *Gemora* asks: What then does 'a man' come to exclude?

The *Gemora* answers: It is meant to exclude a minor from the penalty of *kares* (if he is *tamei* and enters the Temple Courtyard).

The *Gemora* asks: And that which was taught in a *Mishna* that all can become *tamei* with *tzara'as*, what does 'all' come to include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes a minor, for since the verse states, *a man*, I might have thought that a minor does not become *tamei* with *tzara'as*; the *Mishna* teaches us otherwise.

This is based upon another verse, which states *adam – a man*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* that although a woman may contract *tzara'as* as well, it is only a man afflicted with *tzara'as* who lets the hair of his head go loose and rends his garments, but a woman does not let the hair of her head go loose, nor does she rend her garments.

The *Gemora* asks: And that which the *Tanna* says that all may examine the signs of *tzara'as* (for a *Kohen* must pronounce that the afflicted person is indeed *tamei* with a *tzara'as* affliction), and all are fit to examine the signs of *tzara'as*, what does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes a *Kohen* who is not familiar with them and their names.

The *Gemora* asks: But a master has said that one unfamiliar with them and their names should not examine *tzara'as* afflictions?

Ravina answered: This is not difficult, for the *Tanna* refers to one who understands them when they are explained to him, and the master refers to one, who, even when they are explained, does not understand them.

The *Gemora* asks: And that which was taught in a *Mishna* that all are fit to mix (or sanctify) the ashes (of the red heifer), what does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: According to Rabbi Yehudah, it includes a minor, and according to the Sages, it includes a woman, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: All are permitted to perform sanctification, with the exception of a deaf-mute, a deranged person and a minor. Rabbi Yehudah permits in the case of the minor, but invalidates the sanctification of a woman and an *androgynous*.

The *Gemora* asks: And that which was taught in a *Mishna* that all are fit to sprinkle (the purifying waters of the red heifer), what does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes an uncircumcised person (whose brothers had died as a result of circumcision) in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elozar, for Rabbi Elozar said: If an uncircumcised person sprinkled, his sprinkling is valid.

The *Gemora* asks: And that which the *Mishna* states that all may slaughter, why does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: The first 'all' includes a *Cuthean* (converts to Judaism after an outbreak of wild animals in Eretz Yisroel and their conversion was debated as to its validity; they observed some commandments, but not others), and the second instance comes to include a renegade Israelite.

The *Gemora* asks: And that which is taught in a *Mishna* that a man may force all of his family members to go up to Eretz Yisroel, what does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes (*Canaanite*) slaves (who have been circumcised, and the master wishes to sell; he may compel his master to sell him in Eretz Yisroel).

The *Gemora* asks: But according to the one who teaches this law regarding slaves explicitly (in the *Mishna*), what does it come to include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes the case (when the husband wishes to move) from a beautiful habitation (outside of Eretz Yisroel) into a bad one (inside of Eretz Yisroel).

And that which the *Mishna* states that he may not force any of them to leave *Eretz Yisroel*, that includes the case of a slave who ran away to *Eretz Yisroel* (*he cannot be forced to return*).

The *Gemora* asks: And that which is taught in a *Mishna* that a man may force all of his family members to go up to Yerushalayim, what does 'all' include?

The *Gemora* answers: That includes the case (*when the husband wishes to move*) from a beautiful habitation (*outside of Yerushalayim*) into a bad one (*inside of Yerushalayim*).

And that which the *Mishna* states that he may not force any of them to leave Yerushalayim, that includes the case (*when the husband wishes to move*) from a bad habitation (*inside of Yerushalayim*) into a beautiful one (*outside of Yerushalayim, but inside Eretz Yisroel*). (2b – 3b)

Kohanim as well

A *braisa* stated: All are obligated to observe the laws of *sukkah* - Kohanim, Levi'im and Yisra'elim.

The *Gemora* asks: But is that not obvious, for if they are not obligated, who is obligated?

The *Gemora* answers: The ruling is necessary for the Kohanim, for I would have thought, since the Torah says: *You shall dwell in sukkos*, and a master said: *you shall dwell* means - in the same manner as you reside in your house: just as in your house, a husband and wife live together, so too, in a *sukkah*, the husband and wife shall live together, and since the Kohanim must perform the Temple service (*and if he would 'live' – cohabit with his wife, he would become tamei, and this would prevent him from performing the Temple service the next day*), one might have thought that they are exempt from the obligation to dwell in the *sukkah*; we are therefore taught that although they are exempt from *sukkah* at the time of the service, outside the time of the service they are certainly obligated. This is similar to the case of travelers, for a master has said: Those who travel by day

are exempt from the obligation of *sukkah* by day and are bound to it at night.

The *braisa* stated: Everyone is obligated in *tzitzis*, whether they be Kohanim, Levi'im, Yisraelim.

The *Gemora* asks: Isn't this obvious? If Kohanim, Levi'im, Yisra'elim are exempt, who would be obligated?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: The novelty of this listing is Kohanim. One might think that being that the verse states, *you should not wear shatnez, wool and linen together*, and it then states, *you should make tzitzis for yourself*, that only a person who is not allowed to wear clothing of wool and linen mixtures must wear *tzitzis*. Perhaps Kohanim, who are permitted to wear such clothing (*as the priestly garments contained such mixtures*), are not obligated in *tzitzis*. This is why the *braisa* must teach us that although they are permitted to wear this mixture when serving in the Temple, when they are not serving they may not wear such clothing. [*They are therefore obligated in this prohibition and also obligated to wear tzitzis.*]

The *braisa* stated: Everyone is obligated in *tefillin*, whether they be Kohanim, Levi'im, Yisraelim.

The *Gemora* asks: Isn't this obvious? If Kohanim, Levi'im, Yisra'elim are exempt, who would be obligated?

Rather, the *Gemora* answers: The novelty of this listing is Kohanim. One might think that being that the verse states, *you shall bind them as a sign upon your arm, and let them be totafos between your eyes*; only a person who is obligated in arm *tefillin* is obligated in head *tefillin*. Perhaps Kohanim, who are not obligated in arm *tefillin*, for they cannot have any interposition between their vestments and their flesh, they should not be obligated in head *tefillin* as well. This is why the *braisa* must teach us that the arm *tefillin* and the head *tefillin* are not essential to each other, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: the *tefillin* of the arm and the *tefillin* of the head are independent of each other.

The *Gemora* asks: Why do the *tefillin* of the hand interpose? It must be because the verse says: *he should wear them on his flesh*, teaching that nothing should separate between his priestly garment and his flesh. This should also be the case regarding his head, as the verse says: *and you will place the turban on his head!*?

The *Gemora* answers from the following *braisa*: His (*the Kohen Gadol's*) hair would stick out from between the *tzitz* (*head-plate*) and his turban, as he would put his *tefillin* there. [*In other words, it is a place where no garment must go, and therefore there is no question of chatzitzah, and it is not regarded as an additional garment.*]

The *Gemora* asks: The *braisa* states that all types of people are obligated in the *mitzvah* of *shofar*. Included in this listing are *Kohanim*. The novelty of this ruling is that since *Kohanim* are subject to the obligation of blowing during the year (*when the trumpets are blown by the offering of certain sacrifices*), perhaps they are not obligated in the blowing on *Rosh Hashanah*; the *Tanna* teaches us otherwise.

The *Gemora* asks that the cases cannot be compared, for the blowing by the offering was with trumpets, and on *Rosh Hashanah* it is with a *shofar!*?

The *Gemora* answers that the novelty is as follows: A *Mishna* teaches us that the laws of the *Yovel* year are similar to the laws of *Rosh Hashanah*. They both would use a straight *shofar* and there would be nine identical blessings recited by *mussaf*. It follows that whoever is included in the *mitzvah* of *Yovel* should be included in the *mitzvah* of *shofar* on *Rosh Hashanah*, and whoever is not included in the *mitzvah* of *Yovel* should not be included in the *mitzvah* of *shofar* on *Rosh Hashanah*, and since *Kohanim* are not included in all the laws of *Yovel*, perhaps they are not obligated in the *mitzvah* of *shofar* blowing on *Rosh Hashanah* as well; the *Mishna* therefore teaches us otherwise. (3b – 4a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Obligation Of Women To Read The Megillah

Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi ruled: It is obligatory for women to hear the reading of the *Megillah*, because they benefited also by the same miracle (*Haman's decree to kill all the Jewish people included the women*).

The Rishonim dispute whether a woman can read the *Megillah* and discharge the obligation for a man. Rashi maintains that she could and Tosfos cites a Behag that she cannot. There are those that explain the Behag that he holds that a woman is only obligated to *hear* the *Megillah* but not to *read* it. Rashi's viewpoint is easily understood by the fact that the *Gemora* explicitly states that women are obligated in the *reading* of the *Megillah*. The Beis Yosef (O"C 689) writes that according to the Behag, the correct version in the *Gemora* is that women are obligated to hear the *Megillah*.

Mishna Berura (689:13) writes that the reason a woman cannot read the *Megillah* on behalf of a man is because it is similar to *Kerias HaTorah*, where a woman is disqualified because of public dignity.

The Eshkol offers a different explanation and states that a woman cannot read the *Megillah* for a man because of the prohibition of "kol b'isha ervoh."

The Imrei Baruch explains the viewpoint of the Behag why women will only be obligated to hear the *Megillah* and not to read it. The *Gemora* below (14a) states that the prophets offered a *kal vachomer* argument in creating an obligation to read the *Megillah*. If the Jews, who were liberated from slavery in *Mitzrayim* and brought to freedom, sang praises to Hashem when they saw the Egyptians drowning; certainly we should commemorate our deliverance from death to life. That is why we read the *Megillah* publicly, where we are thanking Hashem for saving us from *Haman's* decree. There is a distinction,

however, between the way the men sang praise and the way the women sang. Moshe recited each phrase and all the male Jews repeated after him. The women did not sing; Miriam said each phrase and they responded with musical instruments, not with singing. According to this, we can say that the same distinction should apply by *Megillah*. The men, who sang songs of praise by the sea, have an obligation to read the *Megillah*; the women who only heard the songs of praise have an obligation to hear the *Megillah*, but not to read it.

Putting Tefillin on a Hat

Our *sugya* treats the prohibition of any *chatzitzah* – interruption, separating between the *bigdei kehunah* and a *Kohen's* flesh, as we are told – “...and trousers of cloth he shall wear on his flesh,” interpreted by *Chazal* in our *sugya* as meaning, “nothing should interfere between it and his flesh.”

Shulchan 'Aruch (O.C. 27:4) rules a similar *halachah* about *tefillin*: “Nothing should interfere between the *tefillin* and his flesh.” However, in the following paragraph Rabbi Yosef Kairo writes that for an ill person who must always cover his head, “we should allow him to place the head *tefillin* on the thin hat closest to his head; and he should cover it lest people see it.” Must *tefillin* be put on one’s skin or is it allowed to put them on a hat? It turns out that these two halachos are a sort of compromise in a difference of opinions among the Rishonim.

Our *Gemora* explains that the *Kohanim* did not don arm *tefillin* during their service in the Temple. They could not put the *tefillin* on their sleeves as the sleeve would be a *chatzitzah* between the *tefillin* and their flesh and they could not put them on under the sleeve as nothing must interrupt between the *bigdei kehunah* and their skin. The *Rosh* (Responsa, *kelal* 3, §4) proves therefrom that *tefillin* should not be put on a hat.

However, the *Rashba* inclines to believe that *chatzitzah* is not pertinent to head *tefillin*. In his opinion, the **arm** *tefillin* should not be put on a garment because of *Chazal's* interpretation “a sign to you and not to others.” In other words, the arm *tefillin* should be under the garment and not on it. On the other hand,

this interpretation does not apply to the head *tefillin* and therefore they may be put on a hat (*Magen Avraham* adds that if so, the arm *tefillin* may also be put on a garment if another garment covers them as, according to the *Rashba*, there is no *chatzitzah* in *tefillin* but the arm *tefillin* must be covered).

The two apparently contradictory paragraphs in *Shulchan 'Aruch* are a compromise between the *Rosh's* strict opinion and the *Rashba's* lenient opinion. Therefore, *Shulchan 'Aruch* rules according to the *Rosh*, that “nothing should interfere between the *tefillin* and his flesh.” But a person who cannot put on *tefillin* without *chatzitzah* may rely on the *Rashba*, on condition that people do not see him and learn from his custom (and he should also not pronounce a *berachah* on the head *tefillin*).

It is still not clear as to why a sick person may put *tefillin* only on a thin hat. Is a thin hat less of a *chatzitzah* than a thick one? *Mishnah Berurah* (S.K. 19) explains that the difference does not stem from *chatzitzah* but because a thick hat would interfere with the person’s putting the *tefillin* in their exact position on the head.

DAILY MASHAL

STORY FROM THE DAF

An amazing story is told about the exact observation of *mitzvos* heeded by HaGaon Rav Y.Y. Weiss zt”l, *av beis din* of the Eidah Chareidis in Yerushalayim and author of *Minchas Yitzchak*. Because of his heart ailment, the doctors left an opening in a vein in his left arm with a small pipe, such that in time of need they could inject him immediately. Rav Weiss did not agree to this *chatzitzah*, though he was bedridden, and every morning he removed the pipe, though this involved loss of blood and excruciating pain. During a senior doctor’s visit, Rav Weiss remarked that the injections could be performed in a different way, not involving *chatzitzah*. The doctor agreed and for a long while told everyone about the “rabbi professor.”