



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf טז – Daf לז

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 טז---27-----

MISHNA

- With regard to the kometz, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the issaron of flour, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the wine of nesachim, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- With regard to the oil, its smaller part is essential to its larger part.
- The flour and the oil are essential to each other,
- The kometz and the levonah are essential to each other.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the kometz essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says “milo kumtzo” twice, which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the issaron essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says “misaltah”, which teaches that if anything is missing it is passul.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the wine essential to its larger part? **A:** The Torah says “kacha”, which teaches that it is essential.
- **Q:** Why is the smaller part of the oil essential to its larger part? **A:** Regarding minchas nesachim the pasuk says “kacha”. Regarding a minchas nedavah the pasuk says “umishamnah”.
- **Q:** Why are the flour and oil essential to each other? **A:** The Torah says “misaltah umishamnah” and then says “migirsah umishamnah”. The repetition teaches that they are essential.
- **Q:** Why are the kometz and levonah essential to each other? **A:** The Torah says “ahl kol livonasah” and then says “v'eis kol halevonah. The repetition teaches that they are essential.

MISHNA

- The two Yom Kippur goats are essential to each other.
- The two Shavuot lambs are essential to each other.
- The Shte Halechem are essential to each other.
- The two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim are essential to each other.
- The two spoons of levonah on the Shulchan are essential to each other.
- The arrangements and the spoons of levonah are essential to each other.
- The two types of breads in the korbanos of the nazir, the three items used in the avodah of the Parah Adumah, the four kinds of breads of a Todah, the four parts of the lulav, and the four parts used in the tahara process of a metzora, are all essential to each other.
- The seven sprinklings of the Parah Adumah are essential to each other.
- The seven sprinklings that are done between the poles of the Aron, on the paroches, and on the Golden Mizbe'ach, are essential to each other.

GEMARA

- The sources for the items listed in the Mishna are as follows:
 - The two Yom Kippur goats – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.
 - The two Shavuot lambs – the pasuk uses the term “havayah”.
 - The Shte Halechem – the pasuk uses the term “havayah”.
 - The two arrangements of the Lechem Hapanim – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The two spoons of levonah – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.
- The arrangements and the spoons of levonah – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.
- The two breads used by a nazir – the pasuk says “kein yaaseh”.
- The three items used for the parah adumah – the pasuk says “chukah”.
- The 4 breads of a todah – there is a hekesh to nazir.
- The 4 items used for the metzora – the pasuk says “zos tihyeh Toras hametzora”.
- The 4 items used for a lulav – the pasuk says “ulikachtem”, which teaches that it must be a “complete taking”.
 - **R’ Chanan bar Rava** said, it is only essential that he have all four species. If he has them, but they are not bundled together, that is not essential and he will be yotzeh.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one is not yotzeh unless that are all taken together in one bundle!?
A: It is a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says that a lulav is valid whether or not it is bundled with the other species, but **R’ Yehuda** says it is passul if it is not bundled with the other species.
 - **R’ Yehuda** learns a gezeira shava of “kicha” from the Yidden’s taking of the bundle of “eizov” in Mitzrayim, which teaches that it must be bundled together. The **Rabanan** don’t learn this gezeira shava.
 - A Braisa says, it is a mitzvah to bundle the lulav with the other species, but if it was not done it is still valid. This follows the **Rabanan**. Although the **Rabanan** didn’t even say that it is a mitzvah to bundle them, it is a mitzvah to do so just based on “zeh Eili v’anveihu”.
- The 7 sprinklings of the parah adumah – the pasuk uses the term “chukah”.
- The 7 sprinklings that are done between the poles of the Aron, on the paroches, and on the Golden Mizbe’ach:
 - Regarding the sprinklings of Yom Kippur the pasuk says “chukah”.
 - Regarding the sprinklings of the Kohen Gadol’s par, the par helam davar shel tzibbur, and the goats for a chatas for avodah zara, we learn from a Braisa that learns from the pasuk of “V’asa lapar kasher asah l’par” that they are essential.
- A Braisa says, the 7 sprinklings for the parah adumah that were done not for their own sake or not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal, are passul. The sprinklings of the korbanos brought in the Heichal and of the oil of a metzora that were done not for their sake are passul. If they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says, that regarding the sprinklings of the parah adumah, if they were done not for their sake they are passul, but if they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid!? **A:** **R’ Chisda** said, the first Braisa follows **R’ Yehuda** and the second Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, as we find in a Braisa. The Braisa discusses the chiyuv for a person who walks into the different parts of the Mikdash complex. The Braisa says that there is a machlokes, based on how to darshen a pasuk, regarding a person who walked into the Kodosh Hakodashim, but who did not approach the Aron – **R’ Yehuda** says he would be chayuv malkus and the **Rabanan** say he would be chayuv misah bidei Shamayim. The machlokes is based on whether we understand the word “ehl” of “ehl pnei hakapores” is to be understood to be limited to specifically that case, whereas the **Rabanan** don’t say that. Therefore, regarding the sprinkling of the parah adumah towards the entrance of the Heichal, where the pasuk says “V’hizah ehl nochach” the same machlokes would apply. According to **R’ Yehuda** we understand this as limiting the sprinklings to have to be directed towards the entrance of the Heichal (which is the view of the first Braisa) and according to the **Rabanan** it would be valid even if this was not done (which is the view of the second Braisa).
 - **Q:** **R’ Yosef** asked, based on what we have said, **R’ Yehuda** should darshen the word “ahl” in a similar way, and when the pasuk says that on Yom Kippur the blood should be sprinkled “ahl pnei hakapores” it should mean that the only way to do this is to actually put it on the kapores. If so, during the Second Beis Hamikdash, where there was no Aron or kapores he should not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

have done these sprinklings!? **A: Rabbah bar Ulla** said, the pasuk of “v’chiper es mikdash haKodesh” teaches that the sprinkling must be done at the place where the kapores was, but need not actually be done on the kapores itself.

- **Rava** said, that both Braisos follow the view of the **Rabanan**. The second Braisa is referring to where the Kohen sprinkled with his back to the East and facing the West. The first Braisa refers to where the Kohen sprinkled facing north or south.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that the sprinklings of the korbanos brought in the Heichal and of the oil of a metzora that were done not for their sake are passul. If they were not directed towards the entrance of the Heichal they are valid. However, another Braisa says that even if they were done not for their sake they are valid!? **A: R’ Yosef** said, the first Braisa follows the view of **R’ Eliezer** who makes a hekesh between a chatas and an asham (regarding lishma) and therefore also makes a hekesh between the oil of a metzora and an asham (and therefore requires that the oil be done lishma), and the second Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** who do not make this hekesh.
 - **Q:** Even according to **R’ Eliezer**, how can something that itself was learned through a hekesh (lishma for an asham) then teach further through a hekesh? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, that both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**. The second Braisa is referring to the validity of the korbon. The first Braisa is referring to whether it fulfills the metzora’s obligation.

-----Daf 70-----28-----

MISHNA

- The seven branches of the menorah are essential to each other.
- The seven lamps of the menorah are essential to each other.
- The two parshiyos of a mezuzah are essential to each other. Even the proper writing of one letter is essential.
- The four parshiyos of the tefillin are essential to each other. Even the proper writing of one letter is essential.
- The four tzitzis are essential to each other, because all four of them make up one mitzvah. **R’ Yishmael** says, the four of them are four separate mitzvos.

GEMARA

- The 7 branches are essential, because the pasuk uses a term of “havaya”.
 - A Braisa says, the menorah has to be made of one block of material and it would be made of gold. If it was made of pieces of gold it is passul. If it was made of another metal, it is valid (even if made of pieces of this other metal rather than from one block).
 - **Q:** The requirement that it be made from one block is essential, because the pasuk says “miksha” and “havaya”. In that same way the pasuk says “zahav” and “havaya”, so why is the requirement that it be of gold any less essential? **A:** The word “tei’aseh” teaches that it may be made of other metals as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe instead say that “tei’aseh” teaches that it can be made of pieces of gold? **A:** That can’t be, because the word “havaya” is written regarding the “miksha” requirement.
 - **Q:** The word “tei’aseh” is also written regarding the “miksha” requirement!? **A:** The word “miksha” is written twice, which teaches that it is essential.
 - **Q:** The word zahav is also written twice, so it too should be essential!? **A:** The word “zahav” is written twice and the word “miksha” is written twice. If we say that the requirement that the menorah be made from a single block is essential but that the requirement that it be gold is not essential, we can understand the repetition of these words as they can be used for drashos (as will be shown). However, if we say that the menorah can be made of pieces of metal and that it must be of gold, we would have no drashos for all these words.
 - The drashos are as explained in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says “kikar zahav tahor...”, which teaches that the requirement that the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

piece weigh a kikar is only if the menorah is being made of gold. Another pasuk says it should be made of “zahav tahor” and goes on to require that cups, buttons, and flowers be designed into it. This teaches that these designs are only required if the menorah is made of gold. [The Gemara says, although the same pasuk also says that it should be made of 7 branches, we can't say that that is only if it is made of gold, but if it is made of another metal there is no such requirement, because without branches it is a candlestick, not a menorah.] The pasuk says “v'zeh maasei hamenorah miksha zahav”, which teaches that if it is made of gold it must be made of one block, but if it is made of another metal it may be made of separate pieces.

- **Q:** What does the last “miksha” come to teach? **A:** It comes to exclude the trumpets of Moshe, that a Braisa says were made of one block of silver, and the Braisa says, if they were made of pieces of silver it would be valid, but if made from another metal they would be passul. The Gemara explains, we learn from the “miksha hee” written regarding the menorah that the requirement that the trumpets be made of one block is not essential. The pasuk teaches that this requirement is only essential for the menorah, and not for the trumpets.
- A Braisa says, all the keilim that Moshe made were valid for his generation and all future generations, except for the trumpets, which were only valid for his generation.
 - **Q:** Why were the trumpets not valid for future generations? It can't be because the pasuk says “assei lecha” – for you and not for future generations, because then the Aron should not be valid for future generations either, as the pasuk also says “v'asisa lecha” regarding the Aron!? **A:** Regarding the trumpets the pasuk says twice “lecha”. That is why it is not valid for future generations.
- **R' Pappa the son of R' Chanin** taught a Braisa in front of **R' Yosef** that said as follows. The Menorah was made from a single block of gold. If it was made of silver it would still be valid. If it was made of tin, lead, or “gistiron”, **Rebbi** said it would be passul and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** said it would be valid. If it was made of wood, of bone, or of glass, all would agree that it would be passul. **R' Yosef** asked, how do you explain the shittos of the Braisa? **R' Pappa** said, all views darshen a klal uprat uklal, but **R' Yose** darshens it to teach that it must be made of metal (which is why even tin and the others are valid) and **Rebbi** darshens that it must be a prestigious material (which is why tin and the others would be passul). **R' Yosef** said, erase your version of the Braisa for my version, which says as follows. If a kli shareis is made of wood, **Rebbi** says it is passul and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says it is valid. The machlokes is that **Rebbi** darshens the pesukim of menorah as a klal uprat uklal, and therefore darshens to include anything made of metal, and **R' Yose** darshens the pesukim as a ribuy umi'at v'ribuy, and therefore darshens to include everything except earthenware. **R' Pappa** asked, maybe my version is correct and yours is not!? **R' Yosef** said, two other Braisos clearly say that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that a menorah made of wood is valid. Therefore, it must be my version of the Braisa that is correct.
- **Shmuel** said in the name of an Elder, the height of the menorah was 18 tefachim: the legs and the flower on it were 3 tefachim, the next 2 tefachim were blank, the next tefach had a cup, a button, and a flower, and the next 2 tefachim were blank, the next tefach had a button from which two branches came out – one on each side, rising to the height of the menorah, and the next tefach was blank, the next tefach had a button from which two branches came out – one on each side, rising to the height of the menorah, and the next tefach was blank, the next tefach had a button from which two branches came out – one on each side, rising to the height of the menorah, and the next 2 tefachim were blank, and in the remaining 3 tefachim were 3 cups, a button, and a flower. The flowers looked like cups of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Alexandria. The buttons looked like small apples. The flowers looked like the flowers carved into pillars. Based on this there were 22 cups, 11 buttons, and 9 flowers. The cups are essential to each other, the buttons are essential to each other, and the flowers are essential to each other. The cups, buttons, and flowers are also essential to each other as well.

- **Q:** It makes sense to say that there were 22 cups, because the pasuk says that the menorah (the center branch) had 4 cups and that each other branch had 3 cups. It also is correct to say that there were 11 buttons, because there were 2 on the center branch, one on each of the other 6 branches, and then one on the center branch at each point of where the branches extended from. How do we know there were 9 flowers? The main branch had 2 and each other branch had one, which only makes for a total of eight!? **A: R' Salman** learns from a pasuk that there was a third one on the main branch right above the base.
- **Rav** said that the menorah was 9 tefachim high. **R' Simi bar Chiya** asked him, a Braisa says that the Kohen stood on 3 steps to reach the top of the menorah. If it was only 9 tefachim why did he need steps!? **Rav** said, I meant that it is 9 tefachim tall from the place of the first branches.

-----Daf טו--29-----

- The pasuk says that Shlomo made menorahs of “michlos” gold. **R' Ami** said that it finished up all the best quality gold that Shlomo had, because it was refined over and over. Like **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Shlomo made 10 menorahs. Each one was made with 1,000 kikars of gold, which was then put into the kiln 1,000 times, with the result that each one was only one kicar of refined gold.
 - **Q:** The pesukim tell of the vast amounts of gold that Shlomo had, so how can we say that this finished up his gold? **A:** It finished up this highly refined gold that he had.
 - **Q:** A Braisa tells of how they once put a menorah into the kiln 80 times and it only lost a very small amount of weight, so how could Shlomo’s menorahs have gone from 1,000 kikars to one kicar? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where it was already at a very refined state, at which point it doesn’t lose much weight anymore.
- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** said, the pasuk of “ahl hamenorah hatehorah” teaches that the work of the menorah came down from Heaven.
 - **Q:** If so, when the pasuk regarding the Shulchan says “ahl haShulchan hatahor”, we should say the same thing!? Rather, there we say it means to teach that the Shulchan can become tamei. We should say the same thing about the pasuk regarding the menorah!? **A:** The pasuk needs to teach that the Shulchan can become tamei, because we would think that it is a wooden table that is meant to not be moved and therefore it should not become tamei. The reason it becomes tamei is because it is lifted on Yom Tov to show all the Yidden the miracle of the Lechem Hapanim, how they remained warm from week to week, to show how beloved we are by Hashem. However, regarding the menorah there is no need to teach that it can become tamei. It is a metal keili and as such can certainly become tamei. Rather, the pasuk must be teaching that it came down from Heaven.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** said, an Aron of fire, a Shulchan of fire, and a menorah of fire all came down from Heaven, and Moshe saw them and made the keilim as they looked when made of fire.
 - **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, Gavriel dressed like a tradesman and showed Moshe how to make the menorah – as the pasuk says “v’zeh maasei hamenorah”.
 - **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that said that there were 3 things that were difficult for Moshe to understand until Hashem showed them to him – the menorah, as the pasuk says “v’zeh”, the moon of Rosh Chodesh, as the pasuk says “hachodesh hazeh”, and sheratzim, as the pasuk says “v’zeh lachem hatamei”. Some say also the halachos of shechita, as the pasuk says “v’zeh asher taaseh ahl haMizbe’ach”.

SHTEI PARSHIYOS SHEBIMEZUZAH...

- **Q:** The Mishna said that even one missing letter is essential. That seems obvious!? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, this teaches that if even the point of a “yud” is missing, it is passul.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** This also seems obvious!? **A:** Rather, it is to teach the other ruling of **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav**, that each letter must be surrounded on all 4 sides by clear parchment (it can't be connected to another letter).
- **Ashyan bar Nidbach** said, if there is a hole in the inner part of a “hey” it is still valid, but if there is a hole in the leg of a “hey” it is passul.
 - **R' Zeira** said that **R' Huna** explained to him, if there is a hole in the inner part of a “hey” it is still valid, but if there is a hole in the leg of a “hey”, if enough remains for the size of the smallest letter (a yud), then it is valid. If not, it is passul.
 - **Agra**, the father in law of **R' Abba** had a situation like this, with a “hey” in his tefillin. **R' Abba** paskened for him like **R' Huna** said.
 - **R' Zeira** paskened in practice, for a “vuv” that was partially cut off, that it should be given to an average child to read – if he reads it as a “vuv” it is valid, and if not, it is passul.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, when Moshe went up to Heaven he saw Hashem putting the crowns on the letters in the Torah. Moshe asked, why are you waiting to give the Torah until you finish with the crowns (why can't you give it without the crowns)? Hashem said, there will be a person many generations from now, whose name is **Akiva ben Yosef**, who will darshem many halachos from each of these crowns. Moshe asked to see him. Hashem put him into **R' Akiva's** class. Moshe couldn't understand anything the students were talking about and felt bad about it. Then **R' Akiva** made a reference to a “Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai” and Moshe felt better. He asked Hashem why He is giving the Torah through him (Moshe) instead of **R' Akiva**. Hashem said that that is something he can't share with Moshe. Moshe asked to see **R' Akiva's** reward. He was shown that **R' Akiva's** flesh was being sold in the markets. Moshe asked, that is the reward for Torah!? Hashem said, remain quiet – this is not something that can be shared with you.
- **Rava** said, there are 7 letters that require 3 “tagin” (crowns) each – they are the letters of the word “sha'atnez geitz”.
- **R' Ashi** said, I have seen the Sefer Torah of the expert sofrim of **Rav** and saw that they have a stick going up on the top of a ches, as if to say that Hashem lives up above, and that the leg of the hey does not touch the top. The reason for this is because we are taught that this world was created by Hashem with the letter “hey”, because by being open on the bottom it symbolizes a person's free will. They would be careful to leave a space open over the leg to symbolize that a person who has strayed can always come back in with teshuva.
 - **Q:** Why do we need a second entrance for teshuva? Why can't the person come back in the way he left and strayed? **A:** This is because it is difficult for a person to do teshuva in the same way that he strayed.
 - The hey has a crown on top, because Hashem says, if one returns with teshuva, he receives a crown from Hashem.
 - **Q:** We are also taught that Olam Habbah was created with the letter “yud”. Why is that so? **A:** It is because it symbolizes the very few tzaddikim that there are there.
 - **Q:** Why does the head of the letter yud bend down? **A:** It symbolizes the tzaddikim who walk with bowed heads when they see the reward that others get for their deeds.
 - **R' Yosef** said, **Rav** taught two things regarding a Sefer Torah, and he is refuted from Braisos. One thing he said is that a Sefer Torah that has two mistakes per column may be fixed, but one that has 3 must be buried. However, a Braisa says that if it has 3 mistakes per column it may be fixed and if it has 4 it must be buried.
 - A Braisa says, if there is one column without any mistakes, it saves the Sefer Torah and the rest may then be fixed of its problems.
 - **R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa in the name of Rav** said, that is only if most of the Sefer Torah is written properly.
 - **R' Yosef** told **Abaye**, if a column has only 3 mistakes it can be fixed and is then a “column without any mistakes” and can save the rest of the Sefer so that all the mistakes can be fixed.
 - When we say that 4 mistakes may not be fixed, that is only if it is missing letters. If the mistakes are made of additional letters, it may be fixed.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Abba** paskened this way in practice for his father in law.

-----Daf 30-----

- **R' Yosef** said that **Rav** told him two halachos regarding a Sefer Torah, and each is refuted by a Braisa. The Gemara has already discussed the first halacha. The second halacha of **Rav** is, that if someone writes a Sefer Torah he may end it even in middle of a column.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the end of a Sefer Torah should not end in middle of a column like the other chumashim, rather, he should begin to narrow his lines so that it reaches the bottom of the column. This refutes **Rav**!? **A:** **Rav** was referring to the chumashim, not the end of the Sefer Torah.
 - **Q:** He said he was referring to a Sefer Torah!? **A:** He meant the chumashim of a Sefer Torah.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Yehoshua bar Abba in the name of R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said that "I'einei kol Yisrael" (the last words of the Torah) are written in the middle of the column!? **A:** He meant that these words should be written in the middle of the line. The **Rabanan** say this means it even may be written in middle of a line and **R' Ashi** says this means it should specifically be written in middle of a line. The Gemara paskens that it should specifically be written in middle of a line.
 - **R' Yehoshua bar Abba in the name of R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, the final 8 pesukim in the Torah must be read by one person.
 - **Q:** Shall we say this does not follow **R' Shimon**? A Braisa says, the pasuk says "vayamas sham Moshe Eved Hashem". Can it be that Moshe wrote that while he was still alive? Rather, **R' Yehuda or R' Nechemya** said, Moshe wrote all until that pasuk, and Yehoshua wrote from that pasuk until the end. **R' Shimon** said, an earlier pasuk says that Moshe took "the Sefer Torah", which suggests that it was complete already then! Rather, up until the pasuk that tells of Moshe's death, Hashem would dictate what to write, Moshe would repeat it and then write it. From this pasuk on, Hashem would dictate and Moshe would write it with tears (instead of ink). Now, according to **R' Shimon** the last 8 pesukim are no different than the rest of the Torah and should therefore not be treated differently!? **A:** Even according to **R' Shimon**, since they were written differently than the rest of the Torah, they are treated differently.
 - **R' Yehoshua bar Abba in the name of R' Gidal in the name of Rav** said, someone who buys a Sefer Torah in the market is like someone who grabs a mitzvah in the market. Someone who writes a Sefer Torah is considered by the Torah as if he received it on Har Sinai. **R' Sheishes** said, if he bought a Sefer Torah and corrected even one letter, it is considered as if he wrote the Sefer Torah.
- A Braisa says, a person who is writing a Sefer Torah may use sheets that are 3 to 8 columns wide, but not less or more than that. A person should not squeeze too many columns onto the sheet, because it would then look like a letter. He should also not make it too few columns, because it is then hard to read (it is difficult to quickly go to the beginning of the next line). Rather, each column should be the width of the word "limishpichoseychem" written 3 times. If one is given a sheet that can fit 9 columns, he should not cut it into two so that there is a sheet of 3 columns and a sheet of 6 columns. Rather, he should cut it so that there is a sheet of 4 and a sheet of 5 columns. When we said that he should not put too many or too few columns on a sheet, that is in the beginning of the Sefer, but with regard to the last sheet of the Torah, even one pasuk in one column can be written across the entire sheet. With regard to the margins in a Sefer Torah, on the bottom there should be a tefach, at the top there should be 3 fingerbreadths, between the columns there should be 2 fingerbreadths. With regard to a chumash (written alone, not as a complete Sefer), at the bottom there should be 3 fingerbreadths, on the top there should be two fingerbreadths, and between columns there should be the space of the width of a thumb. In a Sefer, between the lines there should be a space equal to a line, between words there should be the space of a small letter, and between letters there should be a hairsbreadth. A person should not reduce the size of the writing on account of the space on the bottom, the space on the top, the space between the lines, or the space between the parshiyos. If he has a 5 letter word to write at the end of the line (but can't fit in the entire word within the margins of the column), he should not write two letters within the column (if that is all he had room for) and 3 letters outside the column, rather he should write 3 within the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

column and two outside the column. If he has a two letter word to write at the end of the line he should not write the entire word outside the column, rather he should write it at the beginning of the next line. If one made a mistake by leaving out Hashem's Name, he scratches off what was written where the Name should have been written, writes the Name, and he rewrites what was scratched off in the space above the line. That is the view of **R' Yehuda**. **R' Yose** says, he may even write the Name in the space above the line. **R' Yitzchak** says, he can even erase what he wrote, even while the letters are still wet, and write the Name there. **R' Shimon Shezuri** says, we may write the entire Name in the space above the line, but not only part of the Name in the space above. **R' Shimon ben Elazar in the name of R' Meir** said, we may not write the Name on a place that was scratched off or on a place that was erased while the writing was wet, or in the space above the line. Rather, the entire sheet must be removed and buried.

- We have learned, **R' Chananel in the name of Rav** paskened that we write the Name in the space above the line, and **Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel** says the halacha is that one may erase what is written even when wet and write the Name there.
 - They didn't simply say the name of the shitah that they pasken like, because there were different versions as to who said what in the Braisa.
- **Ravin bar Chinina in the name of Ulla in the name of R' Chanina** said, that the halacha follows **R' Shimon Shezuri**, and moreover, the halacha always follows **R' Shimon Shezuri**.
 - **Q:** With regard to which psak of **R' Shimon Shezuri** was this said? It can't be regarding the Braisa, because then when **R' Chananel and Rabbah bar bar Chanah** said their views, **Ravin** should have said his as well!? It can't be regarding a Mishna that discusses the halachos of "ben paku'ah", because **Ze'iri** paskens like **R' Shimon Shezuri** there and **Ravin** doesn't say anything!? It can't be regarding a Mishna that discusses the halachos of gittin for one who is very ill, or regarding a Mishna that discusses the halachos of Demai, because **R' Yochanan** paskens like **R' Shimon Shezuri** there and **Ravin** doesn't say anything!? It can't be regarding the halacha of giving terumah for a plant that grew partly before Rosh Hashanah and partly after, because **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** paskens like **R' Shimon Shezuri** there and **Ravin** doesn't say anything!?
A: Rather, **R' Pappa** said, it was said in regard to **R' Shimon Shezuri's** shitah in the case of a box, and **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it was in regard to his shitah in the case of wine.
- The case of the box is regarding how we measure a box to see if it is large enough that it can't be mekabel tumah. The case of the wine is regarding his view that wine that becomes tamei, even from a sheini, becomes a rishon l'tumah.

-----Daf נ"ג---31-----

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon Shezuri** said, "It once happened that I had tevel of demai that became mixed with chullin and I asked **R' Tarfon** what to do, and he told me to go and buy demai in the market and take maaser from what I buy for the tevel in the mixture."
 - The reason he gave this advice is because he held that most amei haaretz do give maaser, and therefore he would be taking maaser from something which is patur D'Oraisa for something that is also patur D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** Why didn't he tell him to buy produce from goyim, which is also patur from maaser D'Oraisa? **A:** He holds that a goy does not have true ownership over land in EY to make it patur from maaser, and therefore there would be a chiyuv D'Oraisa to take maaser from produce bought from a goy.
 - **Some say** that **R' Tarfon** told him to go and buy produce from a goy and take maaser from that for the tevel in the mixture. He gave this advice, because he holds that a goy does have ownership in land in EY to make it patur from maaser, and therefore he would be taking maaser from something that is patur from maaser D'Oraisa for something that is also patur D'Oraisa. The reason he didn't give the advice to go and buy demai is because he holds that most amei haaretz do not give maaser, and therefore there is a chiyuv D'Oraisa to take maaser from demai.
 - **R' Yeimar bar Shlemya** asked **R' Pappa**, when **Ravin bar Chinina** said that the halacha always follows **R' Shimon Shezuri**, did he even mean in this case as well? **R' Pappa** said, absolutely.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ashi** said that **Mar Zutra** told him that **R' Chanina of Sura** said it is obvious that **Ravin** meant to include this case as well! He didn't say the halacha only follows **R' Shimon Shezuri** in a Mishna, he said it follows him all over, which would mean even when he is quoted in a Braisa (like in this case).
- **R' Ze'iri in the name of R' Chananel in the name of Rav** said, if a tear of the klaf goes into two lines of the writing, it may be sewn and repaired. If it goes into 3 lines, it may not be sewn and repaired.
 - **Rabbah Zuti** said to **R' Ashi** that **R' Yirmiya MiDifti in the name of Rava** said, when we said that when it goes into 3 lines it may not be repaired, that is only if it is "old" klaf, but if it is new klaf even if it is into 3 lines it may be repaired. "Old" klaf means klaf that was treated with gallnut juice.
 - When we say that it may be sewn back together, that is only when it is sewn with sinews, but it may not be sewn with thread.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda bar Abba** asked, what if the tear is 3 lines down, but it is in between the columns (and doesn't go through actual writing)? What if the tear goes in between the rows of writing? **TEIKU**.
- **R' Ze'iri in the name of R' Chananel in the name of Rav** said, if a mezuzah was written with two words on each line, it is valid.
 - **Q:** What if it was written with 2 words on one line, 3 on the next line, and one on the next? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is certainly valid, because it is written like a song (like Az Yashir).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one wrote something that should be written regular and wrote it like a song, or visa-versa, it is passul!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing a Sefer Torah.
 - We find that **Rabbah bar Chanah in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that a mezuzah that was written with 2 words on one line, 3 on the next line, and one on the next, is valid. However, if it was written like a tent (one word on the first line, 2 on the second, and 3 on the third), or like a tail (3 on the first, 2 on the second, and one on the third) it would be passul.
- **R' Chisda** said, the words "ahl haaretz" (the last two words of a mezuzah) are to be written alone on the last line.
 - **Some** say it should be written at the end of that last line so that it should be under the word "shamayim" and **Some** say that it should be written in the beginning of the line, so that it is far away from the word "shamayim" just as Heaven is far away from earth.

-----Daf לב 32-----

- **R' Chelbo** said, I saw that **R' Huna** would roll up his mezuzos from left to right, and would make the parshiyos "stumos" (he would begin the second parsha on the same line where the first parsha ended, leaving some space between the parshiyos, but would not begin the second parsha on a new line).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said that **R' Meir** would write mezuzos on "duchsustus" (the part of the animal hide that is attached to the klaf before being separated, and is closer to the flesh) and would write them like columns of a Sefer Torah, and would leave margins on top and on bottom, and would write the parshiyos "pesuchos" (he would begin the second parsha on a new line). **R' Meir** explained that he did that because the two parshiyos of the mezuzah are not written next to each other in the Torah. Now, **R' Chananel in the name of Rav** paskened like **R' Shimon ben Elazar**. Presumably, he paskened like him with regard to writing the parshiyos "pesuchos". This contradicts the practice of **R' Huna** who was **Rav's** talmid!? **A: Rav** only paskened like **R' Shimon ben Elazar** in regard to leaving margins for a mezuzah.
 - **Q:** How much of a margin should be left? **A: R' Menashyeh bar Yaakov** or **R' Shmuel bar Yaakov** said, the amount needed for the clip used to hold the klaf during the writing.
 - **Abaye** asked **R' Yosef**, do you not hold that **Rav** only paskened like **R' Shimon** in regard to the margin? We have learned that **Rav** says we pasken like the custom that people follow, and we see that the custom is for the parshiyos to be written "stumos", so **Rav** surely only paskened like **R' Shimon** in regard to the margins! **SHEMAH MINAH**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the ideal mitzvah is to write them stumos, but if they were written psuchos it is valid. **R' Shimon** means to say that they may *even be* written psuchos. Based on this, **Rav** could have paskened like **R' Shimon** even regarding this as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring proof to this from a Braisa. The Braisa says that worn out Sifrei Torah or tefillin may not be used for a mezuzah because we don't demote levels of kedusha (and a Sefer Torah and tefillin are more kadosh than mezuzos). It seems that if not for this reason we would use a Sefer Torah or tefillin for a mezuzah. Now, in a Sefer Torah these parshiyos are written stumos! It must be that **R' Meir** would agree that the parshiyos of a mezuzah are to be written stumos. **A:** It may be that he holds that it must be written psuchos. What the Braisa means is that if not from the problem of demotion of kedusha, if a mezuzah was missing (e.g. a pasuk) one would be able to take a pasuk from the Sefer Torah and cut it out to place it into the mezuzah.
 - **Q:** How can we say that if not for the problem of demotion of kedusha we would use tefillin for a mezuzah? A Braisa says that a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai teaches that tefillin should be written on klaf and mezuzos should be written on duchsustus!? **A:** That is the ideal way, but even the reverse would be valid as well.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if the other type of parchment was used it is passul!? **A:** That is only in regard to tefillin.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if either of them is switched it is passul!? **A:** It again refers only to tefillin and means – whether the tefillin were written on klaf, but on the side of the klaf that faced outward of the animal instead of the side that faced inward, *or* if it was written on duchsustus, the tefillin are passul. **A2:** This Braisa is subject to a machlokes among Tanna'im, as we find in another Braisa.
 - **Q:** How can we say that if not for the problem of demotion of kedusha we would use tefillin for a mezuzah? We learn that a mezuzah must have "sirtut". How can tefillin (which don't need sirtut) be used for a mezuzah? **A:** It is a machlokes among Tanna'im, as can be seen in another Braisa, whether a mezuzah needs sirtut.
 - The Gemara paskens that tefillin don't need sirtut, but mezuzos do need sirtut. Also, both of them can be written without being copied from another written text. The reason for this is that their parshiyos are well known by people, and therefore we are not concerned that the sofer will make a mistake if he is not copying from another text.
- **R' Chelbo** said, I saw that when **R' Huna** wanted to sit on a bed that had a Sefer Torah on it, he moved the Sefer Torah somewhere else and only then sat on the bed. He held that it is assur to sit on a bed on which there is a Sefer Torah. He argues with **Rabbah bar Chanah** who said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that one may sit on a bed on which there is a Sefer Torah. Although we find a time when **R' Elazar** sat on a bed and slid off as if bitten by a snake when he realized that there was a Sefer Torah on it, that was actually because he saw a Sefer Torah on the ground, not because it was on the bed with him.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a mezuzah was written like a letter (without sirtut or being particular with proper spelling) it is passul. This is based on a gezeira shava on "ksiva" from the halachos of a Sefer Torah.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a mezuzah was put on a stick and leaned on the doorpost (instead of being attached to it) it is passul. This is based on the word "bisharecha" (*in your gates*, which teaches that it must be attached to it). A Braisa says this as well.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, it is a mitzvah to put the mezuzah on the inside of the doorway.
 - **Q:** That is obvious, based on the pasuk of "bisharecha"! **A:** We would think that since **Rava** says it is a mitzvah to put it in the tefach closest to the street, it is better to put it as far from the house as possible. **Shmuel** therefore teaches that it should be within the doorway itself.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a mezuzah was written on two columns it is passul.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** a Braisa says, if a mezuzah was written on two columns and put into two doorposts it is passul. This suggests that if both columns were put into the same doorpost it would be valid!?
A: The Braisa means that if it was written in two columns and therefore fit to be put in two doorposts (even if it is not) it is passul.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, for placement of the mezuzah (on the right said based on entering the room) one looks to the pivot, which **R' Ada** explains to mean that we look to where the socket for pins on the door are to be placed (when a door is between two rooms and we don't know which is the room being "entered" into, we look to which room has the sockets, and that is the room that is being "entered" into).
- When the Reish Galusa built a house and asked **R' Nachman** to put up the mezuzos, he told them they must first put up the doorposts, and only after they are in place is the mezuzah to be put on it.

-----Daf ל"ג---33-----

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, if the mezuzah was put into the doorpost like a bolt (horizontally) it is passul.
 - **Q:** We learned that **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef** said that this is exactly how all the mezuzos of **Rebbi's** house were put in, and that **Rebbi** did not put up a mezuzah on the entrance to the Beis Medrash!? **A:** It is passul when it is driven into the post like a nail. **Rebbi** would put them in like an "ankle" (Rashi explains this as being fully or at least partially upright) and that is why it was valid.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Huna** did put a mezuzah on the entrance to the Beis Medrash!? **A:** That was because that was the entrance that most people used, and **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says that for mezuzah we follow the entrance that most people use. The case of **Rebbi** was referring to a side entrance, which was not used by many people.
- **R' Zeira in the name of R' Masna in the name of Shmuel** said, the mitzvah is to put the mezuzah at the beginning of the top third of the doorway. **R' Huna** said, it should not be placed within a tefach of the ground or within a tefach of the upper beam, but all the rest of the doorpost is valid.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** holds that the mezuzah should not be placed within a tefach of the ground or within a tefach of the upper beam, but all the rest of the doorpost is valid. **R' Yose** says, the words "ukshartum...uksavtam" make a hekesh from tefillin to mezuzah which teaches that just as tefillin is put on top of the head, the mezuzah is to be placed on top of the doorpost. Now, **R' Huna** can follow **R' Yehuda**, but who does **Shmuel** follow in the Braisa? **A:** **R' Huna the son of R' Nossan** said, **Shmuel** follows **R' Yose**, and **Shmuel** means to say that it should not be further down from the top beam lower than the top third of the doorpost.
- **Rava** said, it is a mitzvah to put the mezuzah within the tefach closest to the street.
 - The **Rabanan** explained, this is so that he should come upon the mezuzah immediately when he enters the doorway. **R' Chanina of Sura** said, it is so that the mezuzah should guard the entire house.
 - **R' Chanina** said, look how different Hashem acts compared to humans. The way of the world is that a human king sits inside the palace and has guards on the outside protecting him. Hashem is not like that – He has His servants (the Yidden) inside the houses and He protects them from the outside, as the pasuk says "Hashem shomrecha Hashem tzilcha ahl yad yiminecha".
- **R' Yosef the son of Rava** darshened in the name of **Rava**, if one dug the mezuzah a tefach deep into the doorpost, it is passul.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can prove this from a Braisa which says that if the mezuzah was placed in the board (presumably the doorpost) or if a brick was put over the mezuzah, if there is a tefach over the mezuzah another mezuzah is needed. If not, another one is not needed. **A:** This is no proof. The Braisa is referring to two doors at the very corner of a house, and means to say that if there is a tefach between the doors (if the corner piece separating the doors is a tefach), then each door needs its own mezuzah. If not, only one mezuzah is needed.
 - **Q:** The Braisa explicitly deals with that case afterwards, so that can't be what it is referring to here!? **A:** It is what is being referred to, and the Braisa then explains the case explicitly.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, if the doorpost was made of reeds, he should cut open one reed and put the mezuzah into the hollow part of the reed.
 - **R' Acha the son of Rava** said, it must be that the reed was first put there as the doorpost and he then puts the mezuzah inside. However, if he put the mezuzah in the reed and then placed the reed as the doorpost, it would be passul, because of “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy”.
- **Rava** said, a damaged entranceway is patur from mezuzah.
 - **Q:** What is a “damaged entranceway”? **A:** It is a machlokes between **R' Rechumei and Abba Yose** – one says it refers to one without a top crossbar, and the other says it does not have doorposts.
 - **Rabbah bar Shila in the name of R' Chisda** said, an “achsadra” (a roofed structure with 3 walls) is patur from mezuzah, because it does not have posts on that 4th side.
 - **Q:** If it had posts it would be chayuv? The posts would be to support the roof, not to act as a doorway!? **A: R' Chisda** meant to say that even if it has posts it is patur, because those posts are only there to support the roof.
 - **Abaye** said, that he saw such posts in the achsadra of **Rabbah's** house that did not have a mezuzah, because they were there to support the roof.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a gatehouse, an achsadra, and a gallery are all chayuv to have a mezuzah!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to an achsadra used for a yeshiva, which had 4 walls.
 - **Q:** Such an achsadra is clearly a proper room and needs a mezuzah. Why would the Braisa have to teach that? **A:** The Braisa was referring to a Roman achsadra (which is enclosed on all four sides, but has windows all around.
 - **Rachva in the name of R' Yehuda** said, a “bei harziki” needs two mezuzos. **R' Pappa Saba in the name of Rav** explained, this is a gatehouse that has one entrance to a house and one entrance to the chatzer. Each entrance needs a mezuzah.
 - A Braisa says, if a gatehouse opens to a garden and to a room, **R' Yose** says it is considered to be part of the room and needs a mezuzah, and the **Chachomim** say it is considered to be part of the gatehouse and does not need a mezuzah.
 - **Rav and Shmuel** both say that all agree that if the pivot is on the house side of the door, then the door between the garden and the house needs a mezuzah. The machlokes is when the pivot is on the garden side of the door. **Rabbah and R' Yosef** say that all agree that when the pivot is on the garden side it is patur from mezuzah. The machlokes is where the pivot is on the house side.
 - **Abaye and Rava** paskened like **Rabbah and R' Yose**. **R' Ashi** paskened like **Rav and Shmuel** l'chumra (meaning that he always required the door to have a mezuzah, no matter where the pivot was).
 - The Gemara paskens like **R' Ashi**.