



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Megilah, Daf א – Daf ב'

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf א---6-----

- **R' Yochanan** said, “When I was young I said something that the Elders agreed to”. He identified the cities listed in the pasuk (quoted earlier) as follows. Chamas is Teverya, and it was called Chamas because of the Chamei (hot springs of) Teverya. Rakas is Tzipori, and it was called Rakas because it was elevated like the banks (raksa) of a river. Kineret is Genosar, and it was called Kineret because its fruits were as sweet as the sound of a harp (kinor).
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we find that Rakas was actually Teverya, as it was often referred to when making hespeidim!? **A: Rava** therefore argues with **R' Yochanan's** identifications, and says as follows: Chamas is Chamei Gerar, Rakas is Teverya, and Kineret is Genosar. Teverya was called Rakas, because even the empty people there (reikim) were full of mitzvos like a pomegranate.
 - **R' Yirmiya** said its true name was Rakas, and it was called Teverya because it is situated in the center (tibura) of Eretz Yisrael. **Rabbah** said it was called Teverya because it had a beautiful appearance.
 - **Ze'ira** said that Kitron is Tzipori. The reason it was called Tzipori was because it was on a mountaintop, like a bird.
 - **Q:** Kitron was in the boundaries of Zevulan. We have learned that Zevulan complained to Hashem about the land they received, since it was not made up of fields and vineyards. If Kitron is Tzipori (which was superior land, which flowed with milk and honey), why did they complain? We have even learned that Tzipori was a large portion of the total land of Eretz Yisrael that flowed with milk and honey!? **A:** They complained because they still wanted more land containing fields and vineyards.
 - **R' Avahu** explained the pasuk of “v'Ekron tei'aker” to refer to the city of Kisri (ruled by Edom, and situated in Eretz Yisrael), and teaches that it will be uprooted, which it was, in the times of the Chashmana'im.
 - **R' Yose bar Chanina** darshened a pasuk to teach that the houses of worship of Edom would be destroyed and only the batei medrash of Edom would remain. He then darshened the next part of the pasuk to mean that the theaters of Edom would eventually become places where Torah would be learned.
 - **R' Yitzchak** darshened a pasuk to teach that Kisri and Yerushalayim can never coexist. When one is thriving, the other lays destroyed, and visa-versa.
 - **R' Yitzchak** darshened a pasuk to mean, that Yitzchak asked Hashem to show favor to Esav. Hashem said, he is a rasha! Yitzchak said, there must be something righteous about him. Hashem said, Esav will eventually destroy the Beis Hamikdash. Yitzchak said, if so, Esav is not deserving to be shown favor.
 - **R' Yitzchak** darshened a pasuk to mean, Yaakov asked Hashem not to allow Esav his heart's desires, and not to allow Germamya to go forth, because if they would, they would destroy the entire world.
 - **R' Yitzchak** said, if one says that he worked hard to understand Torah, but he was not successful, do not believe him. If he says he did not work hard but was successful, do not believe him. If he says he worked hard and was successful, you should believe him.
 - This is only said for Torah, but with regard to success in business, that comes from “siyata dishmaya”.
 - This is also only said with regard to understanding learning. However, remembering what one learns comes from “siyata dishmaya”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yitzchak** learned from a pasuk, one should not fight with a rasha who is enjoying success, because that rasha will win.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan** in the name of **R' Shimon ben Yochai**, and a Braisa both say, that one may fight with a rasha!? **A:** **R' Yitzchak** was referring to fighting regarding mundane matters. The others refer to fighting regarding Heavenly matters. **A2:** **R' Yitzchak** is referring to someone who is not a complete tzaddik, and the others are referring to a complete tzaddik. **A3:** **R' Yitzchak** was talking about a time when the rasha was enjoying success. The others were not discussing that situation.
 - **Ulla** said, Rome is 300 square parsah, and has 365 marketplaces the smallest of which is the bird selling market, which is 16 square mil. The king eats each day of the year from one of these markets. All residents of Rome, and all people born there who no longer live there, receive money from the king. There are 3,000 bathhouses there, and 500 windows which take the smoke beyond the city walls. The city is surrounded by the ocean on one side, by mountains on another, by an iron wall on the third, and by swamps and rocks on the fourth.

MISHNA

- If one read the megilla in Adar I, and then a leap year was instituted, he must read it again in Adar II.
- There is no difference between Adar I and Adar II except regarding the reading of the megilla and the giving of matanos l'evyonim.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to suggest that if one read the "4 parshiyos" (parshas shekalim, zachor, parah, and hachodesh) in either of the Adars, he would be yotzeh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa brings a 3 way machlokes. The **T"K** says, if one read the megilla in Adar I, he must read it again in Adar II, because all mitzvos that apply in Adar II apply in Adar I as well, except for the reading of the megilla. **R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose** says, he need not read it again in Adar II, because all mitzvos that apply in Adar II, apply equally in Adar I. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Yose** says, they must even read it again in Adar II, because the mitzvos that apply in Adar II do not apply in Adar I. All agree that hesped and taanis are assur during both Adars. **R' Pappa** explains that the difference between the **T"K** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** is regarding the reading of the 4 parshiyos: the **T"K** holds that l'chatchila they should be read in Adar II, but b'dieved are ok if read in Adar I, and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that even b'dieved they must be read in Adar II. Our Mishna can't follow the **T"K**, because he says that matanos l'evyonim can be done in Adar I. It can't follow **R' Eliezer**, because he says that megilla can be read in Adar I. It can't follow **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, because he says that the 4 parshiyos must be read in Adar II. Who does our Mishna follow!? **A:** The Mishna can follow the **T"K**, and he really holds that matanos l'evyonim must be done in Adar II as well. He doesn't mention it, because it is understood that it must be done at the same time as the reading of the megilla. **A2:** It may be that our Mishna is only discussing the differences between the 14th of Adar I and the 14th of Adar II, but would agree with **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** that the 4 parshiyos must be read in Adar II.
 - **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of R' Yochanan** paskens like **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Yose**.
 - **R' Yochanan** explained, **R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose** darshens the pasuk of "b'chol shana v'shana" to teach that just as in every year, Purim is in the Adar right after Shevat. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Yose** holds that it teaches that just as in every year, Purim is in the Adar right before Nisnon.
 - **R' Eliezer's** view makes sense, because we never want to delay doing mitzvos. **R' Tavi** explains that **R' Shimon's** view is based on the concept that we want to put one redemption (Purim) next to the other redemption (of Pesach).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** said, **R' Shimon's** view is based on the pasuk of "l'kayem es yimei hapurim hazos *hasheinis*" – meaning the second Adar.
 - Each reason on its own would not be enough, because "b'chol shana..." on its own could have been thought to teach Adar I. "Hasheinis" on its own could teach that it should be kept in both Adars.
 - **R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose** darshens the "sheinis" like **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda**, that it teaches that Purim was first established in Shushan, and then the rest of the world.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** said, Esther asked the **Chachomim** to create the Yom Tov of Purim for all generations. They said, you will create jealousy among the goyim, because we are celebrating their downfall! She responded, the story is already memorialized in the history books of the kings of Madai and Paras.

-----Daf 7-----

- **Rav, R' Chanina, R' Yochanan, and R' Chaviva** taught (note: whenever this group is mentioned in Seder Moed, the name of **R' Yochanan** should be substituted with **R' Yonason**), Esther asked the **Chachomim** to establish Purim as a Yom Tov for generations. They responded that we learn from a pasuk in Mishlei that there should be only 3 mentions of a war with Amalek in Tanach (and we already have mention in Beshalach, Ki Seitzei, and in Shmuel). The **Chachomim** then found a new drasha on the pasuk of "kesov zos zikaron basefer": "kesov zos" refers to the 2 mentions in Torah, "zikaron" refers to the mention in Nevi'im, "basefer" refers to the mention in Megilas Esther.
 - This new drasha is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. **R' Yehoshua** says "kesov zos" refers to the mention in Beshalach, "zikaron" refers to the mention in Ki Seitzei, "basefer" refers to the mention in Nevi'im. **R' Elazar Hamodai** says the drasha is as mentioned by the **Chachomim**, above.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that Megillas Esther does not make one's hands tamei if they touch it.
 - **Q: Shmuel** says elsewhere that Megilas Esther was said with ruach hakodesh. If so, it should make one's hands tamei!? **A:** It was made with ruach hakodesh for purposes of reading, not for purposes of writing.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the megilla does make one's hands tamei!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **R' Yehoshua**, who says that the megilla is not included as part of Kesuvim.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Menasya** says, Koheles does not make one's hands tamei, because it is simply the writings of Shlomo's wisdom. They asked him, a pasuk says there are many more examples of Shlomo's wisdom which are not even written (3,000 meshalim)! Also, a pasuk says, "Do not add to his words". Both of these teach that what was written in Koheles was chosen with ruach hakodesh, and must therefore be part of kesuvim.
 - Both pesukim are needed. If we would only have the first, we would think that Shlomo on his own chose what to include in Koheles. The other pasuk makes it clear that it was through ruach hakodesh.
 - A Braisa brings a number of views as to how we know that Megilas Esther was written with ruach hakodesh:
 - **R' Eliezer** says, the pasuk says "Vayomer Haman belibo" – without ruach hakodesh we would not know what he was thinking.
 - **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk says that Esther found favor by everyone.
 - **R' Meir** says, the pasuk tells us that Mordechai became aware of the plan of Bigson and Seresh (through ruach hakodesh).
 - **R' Yose ben Durmaskis** says, the pasuk says that no one touched the spoils of the war.
 - The Gemara adds, that **Shmuel** said, "I have a better proof than the rest, based on the pasuk of "Kiyemu v'Kiblu", which means that in Heaven they confirmed what the Yidden accepted on earth".

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava** said, all these proofs can be refuted, except for that of **Shmuel**. We may know what Haman was thinking based on logic, we may know that Esther found favor by everyone based on a drasha in a pasuk, Mordechai may have known of the plan because he spoke the foreign language with which Bigsan and Seresh were speaking and planning, and we may know that no one touched the spoils because they may have made an edict that no one should and messengers were sent to confirm that none was taken. **Shmuel's** proof cannot be refuted.
- **Ravina** said, this is what is meant when people say, “One sharp pepper is better than a basket of melons”.
 - **R' Yosef** said, we can prove it from the pasuk that says that Purim will remain in effect for all generations.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it can be seen from the pasuk that says “Their remembrance will not cease from their descendants”.

UMATANOS L'EVYONIM

- **R' Yosef** taught, we learn from the pasuk of “umishloach manos ish l'rei'eihu” that one must send 2 presents to one person, and from the pasuk of “umatanos l'evyonim” that one must give 2 gifts to 2 poor people.
 - **R' Yehuda Nesiah** sent the thigh of a 3rd born calf and a bottle of wine to **R' Oshaya**. He sent back a message, “You have fulfilled the obligation of mishloach manos”.
 - **Rabba** sent to **Mari bar Mar**, using **Abaye** as a messenger, a basket of dates and a cup of flour from toasted wheat. **Abaye** told **Rabbah**, since **Rabbah** is now the Rosh Yeshiva and has become wealthy, he should be sending higher quality gifts. **Mari bar Mar** sent back to **Rabbah** a basket of ginger and a cup of hot peppers. **Abaye** told him, **Rabbah** will say “I sent him sweet items and he sent me back sharp items!”
 - **Abaye** said, I left **Rabbah's** house very full, yet when I came to **Mari**, I was brought 60 types of cooked dishes and I ate from them all, and the last dish was so delicious, that I was ready to “eat the plate”. **Abaye** said, this is what people say that a poor person doesn't even know when he is hungry, and when people say that there is always room for something sweet.
 - **Abaye bar Avin and R' Chanina bar Avin** would alternate every year being the host for the other for the seudas Purim.
 - **Rava** said, one must drink wine on Purim until he cannot tell the difference between “arur Haman” and “baruch Mordechai”.
 - **Rabbah and R' Zeira** ate the seudah together and became intoxicated. **Rabbah** then shechted **R' Zeira**. The next day he davened, and **R' Zeira** was revived. The next year **Rabbah** invited **R' Zeira** for the seuda, and he declined, saying “A miracle does not happen all the time”.
 - **Rava** said, the pasuk teaches that the seudas Purim must be eaten on Purim during the daytime.
 - **R' Ashi** was once by **Ameimar** on the night of Purim and the other **Rabanan** didn't show up. **R' Ashi** suggested that they may be eating their seudas Purim. **Ameimar** said, that can't be because **Rava** said the seudah must be eaten by day! **R' Ashi** immediately learned that Halacha from **Ameimar** 40 times and it was then as if he had it in his pocket (he understood and remembered it clearly).

MISHNA

- There is no difference between Yom Tov and Shabbos except regarding preparation of food.

GEMARA

- From the Mishna it seems that preparatory acts for food preparation (e.g. sharpening a knife) are not allowed on Yom Tov either. Our Mishna must not follow **R' Yehuda**, because a Braisa says that the only difference between Shabbos and Yom Tov is food preparation, and **R' Yehuda** argues and says that even preparatory acts are allowed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The **T”K’s** view is based on the word “hu” in the pasuk, which teaches that only the preparation itself overrides Yom Tov. **R’ Yehuda** darshens the word “lachim” to mean that any act may be done for food – even a preparatory act.
 - The **T”K** would say that “lachim” teaches that one may not prepare food for goyim or for dogs on Yom Tov. **R’ Yehuda** says, the word “hu” teaches that only preparatory acts that could not have been done before Yom Tov may be done on Yom Tov.

MISHNA

- The only difference between Shabbos and Yom Kippur is that one who violates Shabbos b’meizid is killed by Beis Din, whereas one who violates Yom Kippur b’meizid is chayuv kares.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to hold that if one violated Shabbos or Yom Kippur, and became obligated in a monetary obligation from the same act, the Halacha would be the same in both cases (whether he would be monetarily liable).
 - The Mishna must follow **R’ Nechunya ben Hakana**, who says in a Braisa that in both cases the person would be patur from having to pay the monetary obligation.
- A Mishna says, **R’ Chananya ben Gamliel** says, if one who is chayuv kares gets malkus, he becomes patur from the kares.
 - **R’ Yochanan** said, others argue on **R’ Chananya**.
 - **Rava** said, in the Yeshiva of Rav they said that we can see this from our Mishna. Our Mishna says that one who violates Yom Kippur does not get punished by Beis Din. Now, if one who gets malkus becomes patur from kares, the person who violates Yom Kippur can also be punished by Beis Din with malkus! It must be that our Mishna argues on **R’ Chananya**.
 - **R’ Nachman** said, this is no proof. Our Mishna may follow **R’ Yitzchak**, who holds that one does not get malkus for aveiros for which one receives kares. However, it may be that all others would agree with **R’ Chananya**.
 - **R’ Ashi** said, our Mishna is no proof, because it may be that the Mishna means to say that regarding Shabbos the *main* method of punishment is by Beis Din, whereas regarding Yom Kippur the *main* method of punishment is by kares.

-----Daf 7--8-----

MISHNA

- There is no difference between one who is prohibited to benefit at all from another based on a vow, and someone who is only prohibited to benefit from another in a food related way based on a vow, except that this latter person may walk on the other’s property, and may use his keilim that are not used to prepare food.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that both these people would be assur to use keilim that are used in food preparation.

DRISAS HAREGEL

- **Q:** People don’t care if a person walks through their property, so why should that be considered as benefiting from the other person? **A:** **Rava** said, this follows **R’ Eliezer**, who says that this would be considered a benefit.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between “nedarim” korbanos and “nedavos” korbanos except that one is personally responsible for a neder korbon (if it gets lost he must bring another), and is not personally responsible for a nedavah korban.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Mishna seems to suggest that regarding the issur of “baal te’achar” (delaying to bring one’s korban), they are the same.
- A Mishna says, a neder is where one says “I place an obligation on myself to bring a korban”. A nedavah is where one says, “This animal should be a korban”. If a neder korban dies, is stolen, or is lost, it must be replaced. A nedavah need not be replaced.
 - We learn this from a Braisa. A pasuk says “v’nirtza lo l’chaper alav”. **R’ Shimon** says, only when it is “alav” (an obligation on him), does he become personally responsible. **R’ Yitzchak bar Avdimi** explained, it is as if he says “I am accepting responsibility for this”.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between a zav who saw 2 discharges to a zav who saw 3, except that the latter must bring a korban.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that they are the same with regard to making anything that they sit on or lay on tamei as an “av hatumah”, and the requirement to count 7 clean days.
 - **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, **R’ Simai** says, the Torah calls one who saw 2 discharges “tamei”, and one who saw 3 discharges “tamei”. The difference must be regarding the obligation to bring a korban.
 - **Q:** Maybe when he sees only 2 he is tamei and need not bring a korban, and when he sees 3 he must bring a korban but does not become tamei? **A:** If he saw 3, he first saw 2, and therefore must be tamei.
 - **Q:** Maybe seeing 2 requires a korban, and seeing 3 adds the tamei status!? **A:** The pasuk says that the Kohen brings the korban for the zav as a kaparah “from” the discharges. The word “from” teaches that only some zavim bring this korban, not all. Therefore, it must be that only once he sees 3 discharges is he obligated to bring a korban, whereas one who sees 2 is only tamei.
 - **Q:** If we darshen the word “from”, what will we darshen with the word “from his discharges” written in another pasuk? **A:** A Braisa says it teaches that a zav who saw 2 discharges must count 7 clean days.
 - **Q:** If he makes the places that he sits and lays on tamei as an av hatumah, clearly he must count 7 clean days!? **A:** We find that a woman sometimes makes the places that she sits and lays on tamei as an av hatumah and still need not count 7 clean days. Therefore, we need the pasuk to teach regarding a zav.
 - **Q:** **R’ Pappa** asked, how can it be that one “from” is used to exclude a zav who saw 2 discharges (from bringing a korban), whereas the other “from” is used to include such a zav (for counting 7 clean days)!? **A:** **Abaye** answered, if the pasuk meant to exclude the zav in this second case, it should not have made mention at all, and we would automatically assume that he was excluded. Therefore, “from” must mean to include the zav.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between a metzora who has been locked up (to see if he has definite tzaraas) and one who has confirmed tzaraas, except regarding letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing (which only apply to the latter).
- There is no difference between a metzora who becomes tahor without having been confirmed and one who has become tahor after being confirmed with tzaraas, except that the latter must shave all his hair and bring birds for his purification procedure.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Mishna seems to say that the two are equivalent with regard to being sent out of the machaneh, and with regard to their tamei status.
- **Q:** How do we know that a metzora who was locked up and not yet confirmed need not let his hair grow and rip his clothing? **A: R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** taught in front of **R' Huna**, the pasuk regarding such a metzora says “vitaher”, which is past tense, to teach that such a metzora is tahor from certain things from the get-go. These things are the requirement of letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, regarding a zav the pasuk uses the same word and we learn that it teaches that he doesn't create retroactive tumah. Maybe regarding a metzora we should say that it teaches that same thing, and does not free him from the other requirements!? **A: Rava** said, we can learn this from the pasuk of “v'hatzaru'a **asher bo** hanegah”. This teaches that it is only a metzora who has confirmed tzaraas that has the requirements mentioned in the pasuk (letting his hair grow and ripping his clothing).
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, the requirement that he be sent out of the machaneh also uses the verbiage of “asher...bo”, and yet we know that it applies even to a metzora who does not yet have confirmed tzaraas!? **A: Rava** answered, the pasuk regarding sending him out says “**kol** yimei”, which we darshen to include a metzora who does not have confirmed tzaraas.
 - **Q: Rava** seems to say that a metzora without confirmed tzaraas is always included in all requirements unless specifically excluded (e.g. like with the pasuk of “asher bo”). If so, why is he excluded from the requirements of shaving his hair and bringing birds for a procedure!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk regarding these requirements begins by saying that the Kohen goes to the metzora and finds that the tzaraas has healed. That must only be talking about a metzora with confirmed tzaraas.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between the Sefarim of Tanach, and tefillin and mezuzos, except that Tanach may be written in any language, whereas tefillin and mezuzos must be written in Ashuris. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, even Tanach may only be written in Greek (other than Ashuris).

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that they are all equivalent in the requirement to be sewn with sinews, and that they both make the hands of one who touches them tamei.

-----Daf 9-----

USEFARIM NECHTAVIN B'CHOL LASHON...

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if any of the Lashon HaKodesh words of Tanach were written in Aramaic, or visa-versa, or if they were written in the Ivri letters instead of Ashuris, these sefarim will not make hands tamei. The only time a sefer will make hands tamei is when it is written in Ashuris, on parchment, with “deyo” ink. This is at odds with our Mishna!? **A: Rava** answered, our Mishna is discussing where it is written in another language but transliterated into Ashuris. This Braisa is discussing using the foreign alphabet.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if this is true, if the other alphabet is being used, the Braisa should say that it is passul even it is written in Lashon HaKodesh!? **A:** We must say that the Mishna follows the **Rabanan**, and the Braisa follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.
 - **Q:** If that is true, the Braisa should also allow the sefarim to be written in Greek, and yet it only allows Ashuris!? **A:** We must say that our Mishna is discussing sefarim of Tanach, and the Braisa is discussing tefillin and mezuzos, which may only be written in Ashuris, based on the pasuk regarding them that says “vihayu”.
 - **Q:** The Braisa discusses writing Lashon HaKodesh in Aramaic, and writing Aramaic in Lashon HaKodesh. In Tanach there are Aramaic words (such as “yegar sahadusa”), however there are none in tefillin and mezuzos, so what does the Braisa mean? **A:** We must therefore answer that the Braisa is discussing a megilla (Esther) and the Mishna is discussing the sefarim of Tanach. A

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Megilla may not be read in any other language because the pasuk says “kichsavam v’chilshonam”.

- **Q:** What are the Aramaic words written in the megilla? **A: R’ Pappa** says it is the word “pishgam” (meaning decree), and **R’ Nachman** says there is the word “yikar” (meaning honor).
- **A: R’ Ashi** says, the Braisa is discussing sefarim of Nevi’im and Kesuvim, not of Torah. The Braisa would then follow the view of **R’ Yehuda**, who says that a special dispensation was given to allow Torah (but not other sefarim) to be written in Greek. The reason this was allowed was because of the story that happened where King Talmi imprisoned 72 Elders, each into solitary confinement, and ordered them to translate the Torah for him. Hashem put into each of their minds to change the wording of a number of pesukim which Talmi would have taken at face value, and would have misinterpreted the meaning into a disparaging or idolatrous understanding.

R’ SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL OMER AHF B’SFORIM LO HITIRU...

- **R’ Avahu in the name of R’ Yochanan** paskened like **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel**.
 - **R’ Yochanan** explained, that **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel’s** view is based on the pasuk of “Yaft Elokim l’Yefes v’yishkon b’ahalei Shem” (the Greeks, who are descendants from Yefes, will have a place in the Torah of Shem. This teaches that the Torah may be written in Greek).

MISHNA

- There is no difference between a Kohen Gadol who was anointed with the “shemen hamishcha” to one anointed just by putting on the clothing of a Kohen Gadol (which was the process used when we no longer had the shemen hamishcha), except that the latter would not bring the special chatas that is brought by a Kohen Gadol when he paskens wrong and thereby causes people to sin.
- There is no difference between a Kohen Gadol who is currently in office, and one who is no longer in office, except that only the one currently in office brings the special par on Yom Kippur, and the special Korbon Mincha brought by the Kohen Gadol each day.

GEMARA

- The Mishna seems to say that even a Kohen Gadol who was not anointed with the shemen hamishcha will bring the special par on Yom Kippur, and the daily Korbon Mincha.
- Our Mishna does not follow **R’ Meir**, who says in a Braisa that even a Kohen Gadol who was not anointed with the shemen hamishcha brings that special chatas when he paskens wrong. **R’ Meir’s** view is based on the word “hamoshiach” (the additional “ha”) used in the pasuk regarding the special chatas, and comes to include even such a Kohen Gadol.
 - **Q:** The next part of the Mishna, which says that a Kohen Gadol no longer in office has the same status as one currently in office, except for those 2 differences, clearly follows the view of **R’ Meir** of a Braisa (where **R’ Yose** argues on him). How can part of the Mishna follow **R’ Meir** and part not follow him? **A: R’ Chisda** said, we must say that the first part of the Mishna follows the **Rabanan**, and the latter part follows **R’ Meir**. **A2: R’ Yosef** said, the Mishna follows **Rebbi**, who paskens like the **Rabanan** regarding the first matter, and like **R’ Meir** regarding the second matter.

MISHNA

- There is no difference between the large (community) “bamah” and the small (private) “bamah” except that the Korbon Pesach may only be brought on the large bamah. The general rule is, all nedarim and nedavos may be brought on a small bamah. Any korbon which is not of a neder or nedavah may not be brought on a small bamah.

GEMARA

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How can the Mishna say that a Korbon Pesach is the only difference between the 2 when it afterwards says that anything that is not a neder or nedavah would also only be allowed to be brought on a large bamah!? **A:** The Mishna means, anything *like* a korbon Pesach – i.e. an obligatory korbon that has a set time when it is offered – may only be brought on the large bamah.
 - This follows the view of **R' Shimon** in a Braisa.

-----Daf 10-----

MISHNA

- There is no difference between Shiloh and Yerushalayim, except that in Shiloh one was allowed to eat Kodashim Kalim and maaser sheini in any place from which he could see Shiloh, and in Yerushalayim it was only permitted when inside the city walls. In both places one could only eat Kodshei Kodashim when within the curtains around the Azarah.
- After the destruction of Mishkan Shiloh, bamos were again allowed. After the destruction of the Beis Hamikdash in Yerushalayim, bamos were not allowed.

GEMARA

- **R' Yitzchok** said, "I have heard that one may bring a korbon on the Mizbe'ach of Chonyo, in today's times".
 - He must hold that Chonyo's Temple was not made to worship Avodah Zarah, and he must hold that the kedusha of Yerushalayim did not remain after the Churban (which is why he held that using bamos became mutar at that time). This would be based on a pasuk that compares the Mishkan Shiloh to the Beis Hamikdash, and teaches that just as bamos were permitted after the destruction of the Mishkan, they were also permitted after the Churban.
 - They asked **R' Yitzchak**, "Did you really say this?" He replied that he did not. **Rava** said, "He for sure did say it, and I heard it from him!" The reason that he retracted his statement was based on **R' Mari's** question. **R' Mari** asked, our Mishna says that bamos were not permitted after the Churban! Also, another Mishna says this as well!
 - The Gemara says, it is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im whether the kedusha continued after the Churban (and bamos were therefore still assur) or not. A Mishna says, **R' Eliezer** says, I heard that when they were building the Second Beis Hamikdash, they first hung curtains where the Heichal walls were to be built and where the Azarah walls were to be built, and then built the walls. **R' Yehoshua** said, I have heard that we may bring korbanos at the place of the Beis Hamikdash even after the Churban, because the kedusha is still in effect. Now, if **R' Yehoshua** is arguing, it must be that **R' Eliezer** holds that the kedusha does not remain after the Churban (which would also explain why he held that they had to first hang the curtains, which would reinstate the kedusha, before building the walls). We see that this is a machlokes Tanna'im.
 - **Q: Ravina** said to **R' Ashi**, it may be that all agree that the kedusha remains, and each Tanna is just reporting what he heard, but not arguing on the other. The reason that they first hung curtains may simply be to enhance the privacy of the Heichal and the Azarah, and nothing more.
 - We can prove that this point is a machlokes Tanna'im from seemingly contradictory Braisos. One Braisa says, that **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said that the kedusha did not remain after the Churban, and another Braisa says that he said that it does! We must say that the Braisos represent 2 Tanna'im who had different versions of what **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, and we see that this point is therefore a machlokes Tanna'im. We can also answer that the second Braisa should actually be quoted as **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose**, who we find elsewhere to hold that the kedusha remains even after the Churban. Again, we see that this point is a machlokes Tanna'im.
- The megilla begins with the words "Vayehi bimei Achashveirosh". **R' Levi** (or **R' Yonason**) said, we have a tradition from the Anshei Kneses Hagedola, that whenever it says the word "vayehi", it means there was a period of pain (tzar).
 - The Gemara brings several examples to prove this point.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the building of the Mishkan says “Vayehi bayom hashmini”, and that was a very happy time, as a Braisa says, it was as happy a time for Hashem as the time of Creation!? **A:** There was pain there as well, because Nadav and Avihu died at that time.
- **Q:** We find a number of times that the word “vayehi” is used and it is clearly a happy time!? **A: R’ Ashi** said, when only the word “vayehi” is used, it may introduce a time of pain or a time of happiness. However, when the words “vayehi bime’i” are used, that only introduces a time of pain.
- **R’ Levi** said, we have a tradition from our fathers that Amotz (the father of Yeshaya) and Amatzya (King of Yehuda) were brothers.
 - **Q:** Why is this important to know? **A:** It confirms the teaching of **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R’ Yonason**, who says that any daughter in law who is modest in her father in law’s house will merit to have kings and prophets come from her. We see this from Tamar. We darshen the pesukim to teach that Tamar was very modest by her father in law (Yehuda), and we know that kings came from her. If Amotz was Amatzya’s brother, then we also know that Yeshaya the prophet came from her as well.
- **R’ Levi** said, we have a tradition from our fathers that the Aron HaKodesh miraculously did not take up any space in the Kodosh Hakodashim. A Braisa says this as well.
- **R’ Yonason** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk to teach that Hashem will cut off from Bavel their alphabet, their language, their kingdom, and Vashti.
- **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk to teach that in the place of Haman, Hashem put Mordechai. In the place of Vashti, Hashem put Esther. Through this story the reading of the megilla became instituted, and the Yom Tov of Purim remained an everlasting day of happiness.
- **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk to teach that when the decree came about to destroy the Yidden (who were at the time deserving of the decree), Hashem caused the goyim to rejoice at the news of the decree.
- **R’ Abba bar Kahana** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk to teach that Hashem gave Mordechai wisdom, knowledge, and joy; He gave Haman the desire to gather and amass; and He gave this to Haman so that it would then all pass to Mordechai and Esther.
- **Rabbah bar Ofra**n would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk which says that Hashem will destroy the king and princes of Eilam, as referring to the killing of Vashti and the 10 sons of Haman in Shushan (which was in Eilam).
- **R’ Dimi bar Yitzchak** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that praises Hashem for not forsaking us and for giving us favor in the eyes of the Persian kings, as referring to the times of Haman.

-----Daf נ”--11-----

- **R’ Chanina bar Pappa** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that makes reference to Hashem giving us to the control of kings, and that we went into fire, water, and were saved. He explained, going into fire refers to the days of Nevuchadnetzar, going into water refers to the days of Paroh, and when the pasuk says we were saved it refers to the days of Haman.
- **R’ Yochanan** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that says that Hashem remembers His kindness and all the world sees of the salvation brought for the Yidden. He explains, this occurred in the days of Mordechai and Esther.
- **Reis Lakish** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that says, “As a lion roars, and a bear growls, so is a wicked ruler over a poor nation”. He explained that the lion refers to Nevuchadnetzar (as he is so referenced in pasuk), the bear refers to Achashveirosh (as the Persians are so referenced in a pasuk), the wicked ruler refers to Haman, and the poor nation refers to the Yidden, who were poor in their keeping of the mitzvos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk to teach that it was because the Yidden were not learning Torah that caused Hashem to “become poor” in the sense that He made it seem as if He was “unable” to save the Yidden.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that says “Lulei Hashem shehaya lanu b'kum aleinu adam”. The person referenced in the pasuk is Haman.
- **Rava** would begin to darshen the megilla with the following introduction. He darshened a pasuk that says that when the tzadikim are exalted people rejoice – this refers to Mordechai and Esther, as the pasuk says “V'ha'ir Shushan tzahala v'sameicha”, and when the wicked rule, the people sigh – this refers to Haman, as the pasuk says “v'ha'ir Shushan navocha”.
- **R' Masna** would begin by quoting the pasuk of “ki migoy gadol asher lo Elokim krovim eilav” – which can be darshed to be referring to the time of Purim.
- **R' Ashi** would begin by quoting the pasuk of “oh hanisa Elokim...”, which can be darshed to be referring to the time of Purim.
- “Vayehi bimei Achashveirosh” – **Rav** said, the word vayehi is a combination of the words “vai” (woe) and “he” (mourning). This time period had the fulfillment of the pasuk that says that the Yidden will be sold as slaves and no one will buy them (Haman made a rule that no one may buy a Jewish slave).
- **Shmuel** darshened a pasuk as follows: “lo me'astem” – in the days of the Greeks, “v'lo ge'altem” – in the days of Nevuchadnetzar, “lichalosam” – in the days of Haman, “lehafeir brisi itam” – in the days of the Persians, “ki Ani Hashem Elokeihem” – in the days of Gog and Magog.
 - A Braisa darshens the pasuk differently, as follows: “lo me'astem” – in the days of the Kasdim, by appointing Daniel, Chanaya, Mishael, and Azarya to save them, “v'lo ge'altem” – in the days of the Greeks, by appointing Shimon Hatzadik, Chashmonai and his sons, and Matisyahu Kohen Gadol to save them, “lichalosam” – in the days of Haman, by appointing Mordechai and Esther to save them, “lehafeir brisi itam” – in the days of the Persians, by appointing the house of **Rebbi** and the **Chachomim** of the generations to save them, “ki Ani Hashem Elokeihem” – in the Days to Come, when no nation will be able to rule over the Yidden.
- **R' Levi** would begin his drasha by quoting the pasuk in which Hashem tells the Yidden that if they don't kill out the nations that they are supposed to, those nations will later come back to cause them much pain. He darshened that one such nation was Amalek, from which Haman came.
- **R' Chiya** would begin his drasha by quoting the pasuk that says that if the Yidden don't kill out the nations, Hashem will do to the Yidden what they were supposed to do to the nations. This almost happened in the times of Purim.
- **Rav** said, the name “Achashveirosh” can be understood as meaning “the brother of the head”, and having the same character as the head. This is a reference to Achashveirosh's similarity to Nevuchadnetzar. Nevuchadnetzar killed, and Achasveirosh wanted to kill. He destroyed the Beis Hamikdash, and he wanted to destroy it, by preventing its rebuilding.
 - **Shmuel** said, the name can be understood as referring to the fact that he “blackened” the faces of the Yidden like a fire does to the bottom of a pot.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, it can be understood to mean that anyone who thought of him would say, “Woe unto his head”.
 - **R' Chanina** said, it can be understood to mean that all became poor in his days, because he assessed heavy taxes.
- The pasuk says “Hu Achashveirosh” – this teaches that he remained wicked from beginning to end. We find this used to describe others as well – Esav, Dasam and Aviram, and Achaz.
 - A pasuk says “Avram hu Avrohom” – this teaches that he remained a tzaddik from beginning to end. We find this used to describe Moshe and Aharon as well. We also find this to describe Dovid's humility, which remained from his days as a shepherd through his days as king.
- The pasuk says “Hamoleich” – **Rav** said, this teaches that he became king although he was not from a line of kings. Some say this is a praise, that there was no one more deserving than him to take the throne. Others say this was an embarrassment, because he only got the throne because he paid a lot of money to be appointed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- “MeiHodu v’ahd Kush” – **Rav and Shmuel** argue: one says they were on two opposite ends of the world (and shows that he ruled over the world), and the other says that they were right near each other, which shows that just as he ruled over these 2 neighboring countries with dominance, he similarly ruled over the entire world.
 - There is a similar machlokes between them regarding the pasuk that says that Shlomo ruled over Tifsach and Azza.
- “Sheva v’esrim u’mei’ah medina” – **R’ Chisda** said, initially he ruled over 7 countries, then over another 20, then over another 100.
 - A Braisa says, there are 3 people who ruled over the entire world: Achav, Achasveirosh, and Nevuchadnetzar.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t the Braisa also mention Shlomo? **A:** Shlomo’s kingship didn’t follow through to the end, whereas the others did.
 - **Q:** That is correct only according to the view that Shlomo was king and then became a commoner, never to become a king again. However, this is not correct according to the view that he was king, became a commoner, and then became king again. If so, why wasn’t he mentioned in the Braisa’s list? **A:** Shlomo ruled over the sheidim as well, and that is why he cannot be grouped with the others.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t the Braisa mention Sancheirev? **A:** He never conquered Yerushalayim.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t the Braisa mention Daryavesh? **A:** He only ruled over 120 of the 127 countries.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t the Braisa mention Koresh? **A:** Although he said about himself that he ruled over the entire world, it was not true.
- “Bayamim haheim k’sheves hamelech” – this suggests that it was his first year on the throne. The pasuk then says “B’shnas shalosh l’malcho” – which means it was his 3rd year. This is contradictory!?! **Rava** explained, it means that in his 3rd year he finally calmed down, because his calculation of the 70 years from when the Yidden were sent to galus had come to an end and the Yidden had still not gone back to Eretz Yisrael. He felt that they would therefore never return.
 - King Belshatzar calculated that the 70 years ended 3 years before Achashveirosh calculated, because Belshatzar began counting from the rise of the first king of Bavel – Nevuchadnetzar. When the 70 years passed, he began to use the keilim of the Beis Hamikdash for his royal uses. He was punished and died for having done so. Achashveirosh realized that Belshatzar must be mistaken and therefore began counting the 70 years from the time that the Yidden began to go to galus in Bavel – which was 8 years after Nevuchadnetzar came to power. When these 70 years passed with no redemption, Achashveirosh felt that there would not be any redemption, and he therefore also took out the keilim of the Beis Hamikdash and used them for his royal use. He too was punished with the death of his wife Vashti.
 - Achashveirosh’s calculation was also erroneous, because the 70 year count actually began with the destruction of Yerushalayim, which happened 11 years after the galus began.
 - **Q:** If so, 11 years later (in the 14th year of Achashveirosh) the Beis Hamikdash should have been rebuilt, and we know that it was not rebuilt until the 2nd year of Daryavesh, which was 2 years later!?! **A:** **Rava** said, there were a number of partial years of kings. Therefore, when the calculation is made using the years of the kings, there are actually 2 years less (which seem like more because the partial years are listed as full years). Therefore, the full 70 years from the destruction of Yerushalayim did not end until the 2nd year of Daryavesh.
 - **Rava** said, we can learn from a pasuk that Daniel initially made an erroneous calculation as well.
 - **Q:** The pesukim seem contradictory, because one seems to say that the 70 years began when the galus began, and the other says that it began with the destruction of Yerushalayim!?! **A:** **Rava** said, the first time period was for a “remembering from Hashem”, which did occur, as we find that Yidden began to move back to Eretz Yisrael at that time. However, a full redemption and building of the Second Beis Hamikdash did not begin until the 70 years after the destruction of Yerushalayim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf ג'---12-----

- One pasuk says “Cheil Paras Umadai **Hapartemim**” and another pasuk says “**L’malchei** Madai U’paras” (using the title of “nobles” in the first pasuk and “kings” in the second pasuk). **Rava** explained, Madai and Paras made a deal, that whichever of the 2 produces the king, the other will produce the governors, and visa-versa.
- “B’haroso es osher kivod malchuso” – **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, this means that he put on the bigdei Kehuna.
- “U’vimlos hayamim ha’eileh” – **Rav and Shmuel** argue: one says he was a smart king that he first made a party for the subjects of distant lands and then for the people nearby, because the nearby people are always close by and available to be appeased, so he could tend to them later. The other says he was a foolish king, because by taking care of the people of Shushan, he would have created a base of loyal and local support, which would have been available to thwart off any rebellion.
- **R’ Shimon ben Yochai’s** talmidim asked him, why were the Yidden of that generation deserving to be wiped out? He told them, “Let me here what you have to say”. They told him, “It must be because they took pleasure from Achashveirosh’s party”. He responded to them, “If so, only the Yidden of Shushan should have been threatened, not all the other Yidden, who did not even attend the party”!? He explained to them, the reason was because they bowed down to the avodah zarah in the times of Nevuchadnetzar. They asked, if so, why didn’t Hashem ultimately have them killed? He answered, the Yidden only bowed down on the outside, out of fear for Nevuchadnetzar, and therefore Hashem only made the threat on the outside, without intent to actually carry it through.
- “Bachatzar ginas bisan hamelech” – **Rav and Shmuel** argue, one says each person sat according to his status, either in the courtyard, or the garden, or the palace. The other says that initially there was not enough room in the courtyard, so they moved to the garden. When there was still not enough room, they moved into the palace as well. A Braisa says that all were sat in the courtyard, but doors were then opened into the garden and into the palace.
- “Chur karpas u’sечеiles” – **Rav** says that “chur” refers to needlepoint tapestries with many holes. **Shmuel** says it was fine white wool that was spread out for them.
 - **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said that “karpas” are cushions made of fine wool.
- “Ahl gelilei kesef v’amudei sheis mitos zahav vachesef” – a Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** says, those with higher status sat on couches of gold, and those with lower status sat on couches of silver. **R’ Nechemya** said to him, that would cause jealousy! Rather, the couches were made of silver and the legs were made of gold.
- “Bahat vasheish” – **R’ Assi** said, these are stones that are very much sought after.
- “V’dar v’sochares” – **Rav** says there were rows and rows of these stones, and **Shmuel** says this is the name of a very precious stone. The stones were placed in middle of the room and created light for all to enjoy the party. **R’ Yishmael’s** yeshiva taught, this means that Achashveirosh declared a tax holiday.
- “V’hashkos b’klei zahav v’keilim mikeilim shonim” – The word “shonim” means “repeated”. **Rava** said, a bas kol came forth and said, Belshatzar was punished for using the keilim, and you are using them as well!?
- “V’yein malchus ruv” – **Rav** said, this teaches that everyone was offered wine older than they themselves were.
- “V’hashsiya chadas” – **R’ Chanan in the name of R’ Meir** said, “chadas” (laws) teaches that the drinks were given according to the laws of the Torah – there was more food than there was drink.
- “Ein ones” – **R’ Elazar** said, this teaches that every person was given wine from his country.
- “Laasos kirtzon ish v’ish” – **Rava** said this refers to Mordechai and Haman, who were in charge of giving out the wine at the party.
- “Gam Vashti hamalka asisa mishtei nashim beis hamalchus” - **Rava** said, from the fact that she made the party at the king’s palace we can learn that she and the king both intended to bring about zenus.
- “Bayom hashvi’i ketov leiv hamelech bayayin” – **Rava** said this refers to Shabbos. This shows the difference – when Yidden eat and drink they begin to say Torah and sing to Hashem. When he ate and drank, he began with immorality. An argument broke out as to the origin of the prettiest women. Achashveirosh said, my wife is the prettiest of them all. The people told him to bring her out without clothing. Vashti was punished in this way because she would force the Jewish girls to work without clothing on Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- “Vatima’ein hamalka Vashti” – She was as immoral as he. **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, the reason she refused to come was because she got tzaraas. A Braisa says that Gavriel came and gave her a tail.
- “Vayiktzof hamelech me’od” – **Rava** explained, the reason he got so angry was that Vashti sent him a message saying, “You stable boy of my father, my father would drink 1,000 portions of wine and not get drunk, and you can’t hold your wine at all!” That is when he became infuriated.
- “Vayomer hamelech lachachomim” – This refers to the Rabanan. “Yodei ha’itim” – who know how to set the months and years. They said to themselves that they are in a catch 22 as to what to say – if they tell him to kill her, they will be in trouble when he sobers up. If they tell him not to kill her, he will take offense. Therefore, they told him that after the Churban they no longer have the power to judge capital cases.
- “V’hakarov eilav karshena sheisar admasa sarshish” – **R’ Levi** said, this refers to the Malachim begging Hashem to punish Vashti and thereby set in motion a plan for saving the Yidden. These words each refer to an aspect of the korbanos, and the Malachim were asking that the Yidden be saved in the merit of the korbanos that they used to bring.
- “Vayomer Memuchan” – a Braisa says, this is Haman. He was given this name because he was destined (“muchan”) for punishment.
 - **R’ Kahana** said, he was the lowest of the advisors (listed last) and yet he was the first to offer his opinion.
- “Lihiyos kol ish sorer biveiso” - **Rava** said, this letter was thought of as foolish to the people. They felt, of course every man rules his house. Since they saw this letter as foolish, they did not pay much attention to the letters that were later sent that instructed to kill the Yidden.
- “V’yafkeid hamelech pekidim” – **Rav** said, we see the difference between him and Dovid. When Dovid was looking for a girl to be with, every man rushed to offer their own daughter. When Achashveirosh was looking for a girl, every man tried to hide his own daughter.
- “Ish Yehudi haya b’Shushan Habirah...Ish Yemini” – The names listed in the pasuk of “Yair, Shimi, Kish” were names that described the attributes of Mordechai. Yair – he lit up the eyes of the Yidden with his tefilla, Shimi – Hashem listened to his tefilos, Kish – he knocked on the Gates of Mercy and he was answered.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says he was Yehudi (from Yehuda) and Yemini (from Binyamin)!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, his father was from Binyamin and his mother was from Yehuda. **A2:** The **Rabanan** said, that the people of Yehuda would argue and say that although Mordechai is from Binyamin, it is only because of us (Shevet Yehuda) that he was born – i.e. because Dovid spared the life of Shimi ben Geira, who was the ancestor of Mordechai. The people of Binyamin would argue and say, Mordechai comes from us! **A3: Rava** said, the Yidden of the time would fight to put blame for the existence of Mordechai. They would say, it is Shevet Yehuda’s fault for not having Shimi killed, and thus allowing for Mordechai to be born, who now incites the goyim against us by not bowing down to Haman. They would also blame Shevet Binyamin for Shaul’s failure to kill Agag, who was the ancestor of Haman. **A4: R’ Yochanan** said, Mordechai actually came from Binyamin. He was referred to as having come from Yehuda, because he repudiated avodah zarah, and anyone who repudiates avodah zarah is given the title of being from Yehuda.