



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Menachos, Daf 77 – Daf 78

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 77---34-----

- In the case of a stairwell that is open from the ground floor to a second floor, **R' Huna** said, if it has one entrance it needs one mezuzah and if it has two entrances it needs two mezuzos. **R' Pappa** said, we can learn from this, that a large room that has 4 entrances would need 4 mezuzos.
 - **Q:** It is obvious that this room would need 4 mezuzos!? **A:** The chiddush is, that this is so even if one of the entrances is the one that is used most of the time.
- **Ameimar** said, an entrance that is at a corner of the house (it is diagonally across the corner) is chayuv to have a mezuzah. **R' Ashi** asked, there are no side posts to such an entrance!? **Ameimar** said, the walls on the side are the side posts.
- **R' Pappa** went to **Mar Shmuel's** house and saw an entrance that only had a side post on the left side and yet it had a mezuzah. He asked, you must have done this according to **R' Meir**, who says that an entrance with even one side post must have a mezuzah. However, **R' Meir** only says that, when the side post is on the right side, and here it is on the left side!?
 - **Q:** How do we know that the mezuzah must be on the right side? **A:** A Braisa says it is darshened from the word "beisecha". **Rabbah** explained, that this teaches that just as when one walks he begins with his right foot, so too the right side of the entrance is the place for the mezuzah. **R' Shmuel bar Acha in the name of Rava bar Ulla** said in front of **R' Pappa**, it is based on a pasuk that gives primacy to the right side of the entrance.
 - **Q:** What is the ruling of **R' Meir** referred to above? **A:** A Braisa says, if a house has only one side post, **R' Meir** says it is chayuv to have a mezuzah, and the **Rabanan** say it is patur.
 - The **Rabanan** say, the pasuk says "mezuzos" (in the plural). The view of **R' Meir** is as found in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says the pasuk says "mezuzos", which means two. The pasuk later again says "mezuzos", which is not needed to teach that there must be 2 side posts, because that was learned from the earlier pasuk. Therefore, we say that an inclusion followed by another inclusion comes to exclude, and it teaches that even one side post is chayuv in mezuzah. **R' Akiva** says, the pasuk regarding the Yidden in Mitzrayim says "v'ahl shtei hamezuzos". Why is the word "shtei" needed? Rather, it comes to teach that any other mention of "mezuzos" is even one.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "uch'savtum" would lead one to think that the parshiyos should be written onto the stones of the house. However, there is a gezeira shava on the word "ksiva" from a get that teaches that just as a get is written on a sefer, so too the mezuzah must be written on a sefer. Maybe we should instead learn the gezeira shava from the writing on the stones when the Yidden entered EY and say that just as there it was written onto stone the parshiyos of mezuzah should also be written onto the stones of the house? We compare it to the writing of the get, because that is something that applies to all generations just like a mezuzah, rather than comparing it to the writing on the stones, that only happened at that one time in history. We learn from a pasuk that it must be written in black ink.
 - **R' Acha the son of Rava** asked **R' Ashi**, the pasuk says "ahl mezuzos", which suggests it should be written onto the house itself, and you darshen that it makes more sense to say that it is written on a sefer like a get? He answered, the pasuk first says "uch'savtam" which we darshen to mean a "complete writing", which is done on a sefer, and then "ahl mezuzos", it should be put onto the doorpost.
 - **Q:** Once we have the "uch'savtam" why do we need the gezeira shava? **A:** Without the gezeira shava we would think to write it on a stone which should then be attached to the house.

ARBA PARSHIYOS SHEBITEFILLIN...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** It is obvious that a missing letter would make it passul, so why does the Mishna need to teach that? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, this teaches that if even the point of a “yud” is missing, it is passul.
 - **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).
- A Braisa regarding tefillin says, the pesukim say “l'totafos” three times – once written in the plural and twice written in the singular, but all read in the plural – which teaches us that the tefillin must have 4 compartments (based on the written form). This is the view of **R' Yishmael**. **R' Akiva** says we don't need this drasha, and instead learns the four compartments of tefillin from the word “totafos” – with the word “tot” meaning “two” in the Kaspi language, and the word “fos” meaning “two” in the African language.
- A Braisa says, we would think that the parshiyos should be written on four hides and put into 4 compartments that are also made of 4 hides. The pasuk therefore says “ulzikaron bein einecha”, teaching that there should be one remembrance. To fulfil both pesukim we write the parshiyos on 4 hides and put them into 4 compartments that are made of one hide. If all the parshiyos were written on one hide and each parsha is put into a separate compartment (while the parshiyos are still attached on the bottom), he is yotzeh, but he must leave space between the compartments. This is the view of **Rebbi**. The **Chachomim** hold that he does not need to leave space. All agree that there must be a string between each compartment. If the grooves between the compartments are not noticeable, it is passul.
- A Braisa says, how are tefillin written? For the arm tefillin he writes all the parshiyos on one hide, but if he wrote them on separate hides and then put it into the one compartment of the arm tefillin, he is yotzeh. However, **R' Yehuda** says that he must attach the hides before putting them in, based on the pasuk of “v'haya lecha l'os ahl yadcha” – just as there is only one compartment there should only be one hide inside as well. **R' Yose** says he does not have to attach them to be yotzeh. **R' Yose** said, **R' Yehuda** agrees with me that if someone doesn't have arm tefillin but has 2 head tefillin, he should cover one of them with a piece of leather (to make it look like one compartment) and put it on his arm.
 - **Q:** This seems to be the point of machlokes, so how can he say that **R' Yehuda** agrees with him? **A: Rava** said, we see from here that **R' Yehuda** retracted his view and holds that the parshiyos would not need to be attached to be yotzeh.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Chananya in the name of R' Yochanan** said that one may use an arm tefillin for head tefillin but not the reverse, because we don't demote in levels of kedusha!? **A: R' Yochanan** was discussing tefillin that was used as head tefillin already, and **R' Yose** was discussing before the tefillin were ever used.
- A Braisa says, what is the order of the parshiyos? “Kadesh li”, and “v'haya ki yivi'acha” are on the right, and “shema” and “v'haya ihm shamo'ah” are on the left.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says the reverse!? **A: Abaye** said, they both agree, just one is talking from the perspective of a reader of the parshiyos and the other is talking from the perspective of the one putting on the tefillin. According to both it is done as is their order in the Torah.
 - **R' Chananel in the name of Rav** said, if one changed the order of the parshiyos, it is passul.
 - **Abaye** said, that is only if he switched an inner parsha for an outer parsha (he switched 1 for 2, or 3 for 4). However, if he switched the inners or the outers it is not a problem. **Rava** argued and said that in all these cases the tefillin would be passul.

-----Daf תלך-----35-----

- **R' Chananel in the name of Rav** said, the “titura” (the base around the bottom of the box of the tefillin) is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. **Abaye** said, the “mabarta” (the piece beyond the titura, where the straps are passed through) is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. **Abaye** also said, the letter “shin” that protrudes from the box of the tefillin is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. Also, the grooves between the compartments must reach the place of the stitching. **R' Dimi** of Neharda'ah said, as long as the grooves are noticeable, they don't have to reach all the way to the stitching.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Abaye** said, the parchment of the tefillin must be checked for any holes, because a perfect writing is required, which there is not if there is a hole. **R' Dimi** of Neharda'ah said, it need not be checked, because the quill checks it during the writing (if there is a hole it will become noticed when it is written).
- **R' Yitzchak** said, the halacha that the straps must be black is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the straps must be made of leather, but it can be dyed green, black or white, just not red, because that is disgraceful (it makes it look like the person was bleeding from scabs) and for “another reason” (so people shouldn't think he was with his wife while he was wearing his tefillin and she was a nidah). We see it does not have to be black!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to the color of the straps on the inside, whereas **R' Yitzchak** was referring to the outside.
 - **Q:** If it is referring to the inside, what is the problem with it being red, since no one will see it anyway!? **A:** There are times when the straps become inverted.
- A Braisa says, the halacha that tefillin must be square is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. **R' Pappa** said, this must be so even with the stitching (it can't be too tight to ruin the square) and in the diagonal (the diagonal must be 1.4x the side of the square, which is what the **Rabanan** said is the ratio of a diagonal to a perfect square).
 - **Q:** Maybe a proof can be brought from a Mishna that says that tefillin that are round are a danger and one is not yotzeh with them. **A:** That Mishna may be referring to tefillin that is round like a nut, but not one that is round and flat.
- **R' Huna** said, if tefillin have a hole, as long as the compartments that are seen on the outside are intact, they are valid. **R' Chisda** said, if two walls are split the tefillin is valid. If three walls are split, it is passul.
 - **Rava** said, 2 that are split are valid only when the 2 split walls are not next to each other. Even then, they are only passul if they are new tefillin. **R' Yosef** explained, “old” means that the leather can be stretched and then shrink back into place. Or, “new” means that it can be pulled by the straps without it breaking apart.
- **Abaye's** tefillin strap tore. He asked **R' Yosef** if he could simply knot it back with the other piece. **R' Yosef** said, the pasuk of “ukshartam” teaches that it must be a perfect tying to the hand, which means that the straps cannot be torn.
 - **R' Acha the son of R' Yosef** asked **R' Ashi** if the strap may be sewn back together. **R' Ashi** said, go look and see that no one does that, so you should not either.
 - **R' Pappa** said, if the straps hanging from the knot of the head tefillin tore off, leaving only a little piece after the knot, it is valid. However, the Gemara says that this is not correct.
 - **Q:** This suggests that there is a minimum amount of strap that must hang from the knot. What is that amount? **A: Rami bar Chama in the name of Reish Lakish** said, until the index finger. **R' Kahana** explained this as the distance between the index and middle fingers when spread apart, and **R' Ashi** explained this as the distance between the index finger and thumb when spread apart.
 - **Rabbah** would leave the straps from the knots hanging in the back. **R' Acha bar Yaakov** would braid them. **Mar the son of Rabana** would do as we do (let them hang in the front).
- **R' Yehuda the son of R' Shmuel bar Shilas in the name of Rav** said, the knot of the tefillin is required by a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai. **R' Nachman** said, all the designs must be facing to the outside (the letters of Hashem's Name that are written on the outside – the shin on the box, the daled of the knot of the head tefillin, and the yud of the knot of the arm tefillin; a second pshat is that the painted side of the straps must be facing the outside).
 - **R' Ashi's** straps once inverted. **Mar Zutra** asked, you don't hold that the painted side must be facing out? **R' Ashi** said, “I didn't realize that it inverted”.
- The pasuk says that the nations will see the Name of Hashem on us and will fear us. **R' Eliezer Hagadol** said in a Braisa that this refers to the head tefillin.
 - The pasuk says that Hashem removed His hand and showed His back to Moshe. **R' Chama bar Bizna in the name of R' Shimon Chasida** said, that Hashem showed Moshe the knot of His tefillin.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda** said, the knot of the tefillin must be above the neck, on the head, and opposite the person's face.
- **R' Shmuel bar Bidri in the name of Rav** said, the bracha on tefillin is made after putting them on.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that all brachos are to be made before the mitzvah is done!? **A: Abaye and Rava** said, the bracha is made between the putting of the tefillin in the proper place and the tying of the tefillin to the person.

-----Daf 17-----36-----

- **R' Chisda** said, if one speaks between putting on the arm tefillin and the head tefillin he must make another bracha.
 - **Q:** This suggests that if he did not speak he would not make another bracha. However, we find that **R' Chiya the son of R' Huna in the name of R' Yochanan** said that on the arm tefillin one makes the bracha of "l'hani'ach tefillin" and on the head tefillin one makes the bracha of "ahl mitzvas tefillin"!? **A: Abaye and Rava** said, if one didn't speak between, he only makes one bracha. If one did speak he makes both these brachos.
 - A Braisa says, if one spoke between putting on the two tefillin and did not make a second bracha, he has committed an aveirah.
- A Braisa says, when putting on tefillin one first puts on the arm tefillin and then the head tefillin. When removing the tefillin, one first removes the head tefillin and then the arm tefillin.
 - **Q:** It makes sense to first put on the arm tefillin, as the pasuk first says "ukshartam l'os ahl yadecha" and then afterwards says "v'hayu l'totafos bein einecha". How do we know that when removing the tefillin the head tefillin is to be removed first? **A: Rabbah** said that **R' Huna** explained that the pasuk of "v'hayu l'totafos bein einecha" teaches that whenever the head tefillin are on, the person must be wearing both tefillin.
- A Braisa says, if one had to put on tefillin before alos hashachar, the proper time to make the bracha on the tefillin is the time when tefillin should be worn (which is when there is enough light to see someone who is 4 amos away). If one needs to travel early and is afraid to take his tefillin along with him for fear of losing them, he may put on the tefillin even when it is still dark, and when the proper time for tefillin arrives, he touches the tefillin and then makes a bracha. Until when may one put on tefillin? Until shkia. **R' Yaakov** said, until people are no longer in the market. The **Chachomim** say, until it is time for sleeping. The **Chachomim and R' Yaakov** agree that if one removed his tefillin to go to the bathroom or to the bathhouse and shkia arrived, he should not put them back on.
 - **R' Nachman** said, the halacha follows **R' Yaakov**, because **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** would daven maariv in their tefillin. **Others** say that **R' Nachman** said the halacha does not follow **R' Yaakov**, and the practice of **R' Chisda and Rabbah bar R' Huna** would argue on **R' Nachman**.
 - **Q:** We find that **Rabbah bar R' Huna** says that if it is safek night or day, one need not remove his tefillin but may also not put on his tefillin. This suggests that when it is definitely night one must remove his tefillin. If so, how could he have worn his tefillin at night!? **A:** This ruling of **Rabbah bar R' Huna** was regarding bein hashmashos on Friday (going into Shabbos).
 - **Q:** What does he hold? If he holds that nighttime is a proper time for tefillin then he would hold that Shabbos is also a proper time for tefillin, and if he holds that Shabbos is not a proper time for tefillin then he would also hold that nighttime is not a proper time for tefillin!? These two go together, because they are both learned from the pasuk of "miyamim yamima" and are therefore treated the same!? **A:** He holds that nighttime is a proper time for tefillin and holds that Shabbos is not, but he learns that Shabbos is not, based on a drasha of **R' Akiva** who said that tefillin is referred to as an "ois" and on Shabbos we don't need the "ois" of tefillin, because Shabbos itself is an "ois".

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** said, anyone who puts on tefillin after shkia is oiver on an assei. **R' Yochanan** said he would be oiver on a lav. They both darshen the issur based on the pasuk of “v'shamarta es hachuka hazos miyamim yamimah”.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should say that they argue in the concept of **R' Avin in the name of R' Illa'ah**, who says that “hishamer” creates a lav – **R' Yochanan** would agree with this and **R' Elazar** would disagree? **A:** They both agree with **R' Avin**. The machlokes is that **R' Elazar** holds that “hishamer” regarding something not to be done is a lav, but regarding something to be done would be an assei. **R' Yochanan** holds that even regarding something to be done it would be an assei.
 - **R' Elazar** said, if one wants to put on his tefillin at night to protect them, it is mutar.
 - **Ravina** saw **R' Ashi** put on tefillin at night, and he explained that he did so to protect them. **Ravina** said that he saw that in truth **R' Ashi** put it on because he held that one can fulfil the mitzvah of tefillin at night, but that we don't pasken that way for people.
- **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, a person must constantly touch his tefillin to remain aware of them. This is based on a kal v'chomer from the tzitz – the pasuk teaches that the Kohen Gadol cannot be “mesi'ach daas” from the tzitz, which only has one Name of Hashem, so certainly one can't be “mesi'ach daas” from tefillin, which has the Names of Hashem written many times in them.

-----Daf תל"ג---37-----

- A Braisa says, the word “yadcha” written regarding tefillin refers to the left arm. Maybe it refers to the right arm? The Braisa brings 3 pesukim that mention “yad” and a reference to the right hand, which shows that “yad” on its own refers to the left hand. **R' Yose Hachoreim** said, these pesukim are not a proof, because we find other uses of “yad” made in reference to the right hand. [The **T”K** would say that those pesukim make reference to the “right” hand, but “hand” on its own refers to the left hand.] **R' Nosson** says, we have a hekesh from “ukshartam” to “uch'savtam”, which teaches that just as the writing must be done with the right hand, the tying must be done with the right hand, which means that it is tied to the left hand.
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yose Hachoreim** know that tefillin is put on the left hand? **A:** He learns it like **R' Nosson**. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said, the word “yadcha”, written with a “hey” at the end, teaches that it is to be put on the weaker hand.
 - **Q:** **R' Abba** asked **R' Ashi**, maybe it refers to the stronger hand? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, if it was written with a “ches” you would be correct, but it is written with a “hey”.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Ashi** as well. **Others** in that Braisa say that “yadcha” comes to teach that even one who only has a little bit of an arm left, puts tefillin on it.
 - Another Braisa says, if one has no left arm, he is patur from tefillin. **Others** say that “yadcha” teaches that even one who only has a little bit of an arm left, puts tefillin on it.
- A Braisa says, a leftie puts tefillin on his right arm, since that is his “left arm” (his weaker arm).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that even a leftie put tefillin on his left arm!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the Braisa is referring to a person who is ambidextrous.
- A Braisa was taught in the yeshiva of **Menashe** that says, “ahl yadcha” teaches that the arm tefillin is put on the fleshy part of the upper arm. “Bein Einecha” teaches that the head tefillin is put on the “kadkod”, which the yeshiva of **R' Yannai** taught refers to the place of the soft-spot of a baby's head.
 - **Plimo** asked **Rebbi**, if someone has two heads, which head does he put the tefillin on? **Rebbi** responded, either go into galus or accept cheirem (for asking a question about circumstances that can't exist)! Just then a man came and asked **Rebbi**, “a son was born to me that has two heads, how much do I have to give the Kohen for pidyon haben?” A certain Elder said, he must give 10 sela'im.
 - **Q:** **Rami bar Chama** has taught that a baby that can't live doesn't need to be redeemed, and a child with two heads should therefore be patur!? **A:** This case is different, because the pasuk says that the pidyon haben is based on “heads”.
 - **Q:** How do we know that “yadcha” refers to the fleshy part of the upper arm? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says “ahl yadcha”, which refers to the upper part of the arm. Maybe say it refers to the actual hand? The

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Torah says to put tefillin on the hand and on the head – just as the tefillin on the head is put on the height of the head, so too the tefillin of the hand is put on the height of the arm. **R' Eliezer** says, the pasuk says “v'haya lecha l'os”, which teaches that it should be an “ois” for you, and for noone else, which means it is put on a place which is not visible. Therefore, it can't mean the hand. **R' Yitzchak** said, the pasuk says “ahl livavchem...ukshartem”, which teaches that it should be put on the arm opposite the heart.

- **R' Chiya and R' Acha the son of R' Avya** would be careful to put the arm tefillin opposite the heart.
- **R' Ashi** saw that there was a tear in **Ameimar's** garment, making his arm tefillin visible. He asked him, the pasuk says it should be for *you* for an “ois” and not for others!? He replied, that just means that it should be put on a place that is not usually visible. It does not mean that the tefillin may not be seen.
- **Q:** How do we know that the head tefillin is put at the height of the head? **A:** A Braisa says, “bein einecha” refers to the height of the head. Maybe it means literally between the eyes? There is a gezeira shava from tefillin to the lav for a mourner to make a bald spot – just as there it refers to the top of the head, where it is possible to make a bald spot, so too by tefillin it refers to the top of the head. **R' Yehuda** says, the Torah says to put tefillin on the hand and on the head – just as the tefillin on the arm is on a place that can only get one type of tzaraas, the same is with the place of the head tefillin. Therefore, it cannot be between the eyes, because that is subject to tzaraas of the flesh and of the hair.

ARBAH TZITZIYOS M'AKVOS ZU ES ZU...

- **Q:** What is the difference between the **T”K** and **R' Yishmael**? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, the difference would be where there is a linen garment with wool tzitzis. If one put only 3 tzitzis on it, according to the **T”K** he would be chayuv for shaatnez, but according to **R' Yishmael** he would not. **A2:** **Rava bar Ahina** said, the machlokes would be regarding a talis that has 5 corners. According to the **T”K** it needs only 4 tzitziyos, and according to **R' Yishmael** it would need 5. **A3:** **Ravina** said, they would argue whether a talis with only 3 tzitziyos on it, that was worn outside on Shabbos would make the person chayuv a chatas for carrying on Shabbos – which **R' Huna** speaks about and says he would be chayuv.
 - **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, if one cuts off the 4th corner of his talis he does not make it patur from tzitzis, because it becomes a talis of 5 corners, which is also chayuv in tzitzis.
 - **R' Mesharshiya** said, if one knots down (rather than stitch) his corners to round them, they are still chayuv in tzitzis, because we view it as if the knots are untied.
 - **R' Dimi of Neharda'ah** said, if one stiches down his corners to round them, they are still chayuv in tzitzis, since we can tell that he intends to undo the stitches. If he didn't intend to undo the stitches, he would have cut the corners off.

R' YISHMAEL OMER ARBATAN ARBAH MITZVOS

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, that the halacha follows **R' Yishmael**. The Gemara says, the halacha does not follow him.
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi's** corner and tzitzis of his garment once tore off on Shabbos, without him realizing it. When he later realized what happened, he said, had I known I would have taken off the garment right there where it happened (which follows the view of the **T”K** of the Mishna).
 - **Q:** We have learned that human dignity is greater than a lav in the Torah, so why would he have embarrassed himself by removing his garment just to prevent carrying on the Shabbos? **A:** **Rav bar Shaba** explained to **R' Kahana** that this refers only to the lav of “lo sasur” (which says that we must listen to the **Rabanan** when they make a ruling), but not to other lavim in the Torah.
 - **Others** said, that the story was that **Mar bar R' Ashi** was made aware of what happened, and he said that he will not take off his garment, because human dignity is more important than a lav in the Torah.
 - **Q:** We have learned that **Rav bar Shaba** explained to **R' Kahana** that this refers only to the lav of “lo sasur”, but not to other lavim in the Torah!? **A:** **Mar bar R' Ashi** was

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

walking in a “karmelis” at the time, which is a place which is assur to carry on Shabbos only D’Rabanan. Therefore, the only lav he would be oiver for carrying was the lav of “lo sasur”.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAKOMETZ RABBAH!!!

-----Daf פלל---38-----

PEREK HATECHEILES -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- The techeiles strings of the tzitzis are not essential to the white strings, and the white strings are not essential to the techeiles strings.
- The arm tefillin is not essential to the head tefillin, and the head tefillin is not essential to the arm tefillin.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Must we say that the Mishna does not follow the view of **Rebbi**? A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says that the pasuk of “ure’isem oso” teaches that the techeiles and the white strings are essential to each other. The **Chachomim** say they are not essential to each other. [**Rebbi’s** view is based on the word “hakanaf”, which he says teaches that the tzitzis should be made of the material of the garment – i.e. white, and then says “psil techeiles”, and the pasuk then says “ure’isem oso”, which teaches that the tzitzis are not valid unless both strings are present. The **Rabanan** hold that “ure’isem oso” (“it”) implies that each one by itself would make it valid.] Must we say that out Mishna does not follow **Rebbi**? **A: R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna can follow **Rebbi**, because the Mishna only means to say that whichever was put into the garment first (whether the white or the blue was put in first) it will be valid. The Mishna needed to teach this because a Braisa says it is a mitzvah to put in the white threads before putting in the techeiles, but if the techeiles was put in first he is yotzeh, but he lacks a mitzvah.
 - **Q:** What is meant that he “lacks a mitzvah”? It can’t mean that by putting in the techeiles first he lacks the entire mitzvah of the white strings but is yotzeh the mitzvah of the techeiles, because **Rebbi** holds that the white strings and the techeiles are essential to each other!? **A: R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, it means that he did not do the mitzvah in the best way, but he is still yotzeh.
 - **Q:** That can explain what is meant when the Mishna says that the white strings are not essential to the techeiles, but what is meant when the Mishna says that the techeiles is not essential to the white threads? We find that **Shmuel** explained the Mishna in this way to **Levi** as well, but again, what is meant when the Mishna says that the techeiles is not essential to the white threads?**A: Rami bar Chama** said, this part of the Mishna refers to a garment made of techeiles, in which case it is a mitzvah to first put in the techeiles strings, based on the pasuk of “hakanaf”. However, if the white strings were put in first, he will still be yotzeh.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, does the color of the garment determine the order in which the tzitzis are supposed to be put in?! Of course not! Even if the garment is of techeiles the white strings should surely be put in first!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the Mishna’s ruling is referring to where the tzitzis have ripped, leaving only small pieces remaining. The Mishna is teaching that if there were valid tzitzis and now only white strings remain in full and the techeiles have only little pieces remaining, or visa-versa, the tzitzis are still valid. For we find that the sons of **R’ Chiya** say that the little remaining pieces of techeiles (of tzitzis) and the little remaining pieces of “eizov” (used for the para adumah) are valid.
 - **Q:** How much of the string has to remain for it to be valid? **A: Bar Hamduri in the name of Shmuel** said, it must be enough to make a slipknot with them.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Does that mean they must be enough to make a slipknot of them all together (which would require a longer string) or of each one separately? **TEIKU**.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, if the pieces that remain are so thick that they can't be made into this knot, but if they were thinner they would be long enough, is it valid? **A: R' Acha the son of Rava** said, since they are more noticeable when they are thick, they are certainly valid.
- **Q:** Who is the Tanna that argues on **Rebbi** (and holds that the white strings and the techeiles are not essential to each other)? **A:** It is **R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Nosson in the name of R' Yose Haglili**, who says in a Braisa in the name of **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** that if one has no techeiles he should use all white strings for his tzitzis.
- **Rava** said, we can learn from the ruling of **R' Chiya's** sons that we must tie a knot at every section of the braiding of the tzitzis. If it is not required, then how can it be valid when the loose strings have broken off? When they break off they will cause the knot there to open up. If there are no other knots further up, the entire tzitzis will unravel. It must be that every section is knotted.
 - This is no proof. It may be that **R' Chiya's** sons were referring to a case where every section was knotted, but it may be that that is not a requirement.

-----Daf 39-----

- **Rabbah** said, we can prove that the upper knot of the tzitzis is required D'Oraisa. If it was only required D'Rabanan, why would we need a pasuk to teach that it is mutar to put woolen tzitzis on a linen garment? The tzitzis could simply be wound together without being knotted and it would not be shaatnez, since it is not knotted. Rather, it must be that the knotting is required D'Oraisa.
- **Rabbah bar R' Ada in the name of R' Ada in the name of Rav** said, if one of the strings ripped at the place where it is attached to the garment, it is passul (even though it stays in place because it is wound with the other strings).
 - **R' Nachman** repeated this ruling. **Rava** asked him, a Braisa says the required length of the strings must only be met at the time that the tzitzis are made. However, if they had the required length when they were made and then later ripped, the "shiyarav" and "gardumav" (both words referring to leftover strings) are valid. Now, what are the two words referring to? Presumably "shiyarav" is referring to where some of the string ripped off and some of it remains, and "gardumav" refers to where it was completely torn off at the place that it was attached to the garment. We see that even in this case it is valid!? **R' Nachman** said, the two words are meant to be understood together, as referring to where the ripped string has something still hanging, and the double verbiage teaches that the amount left hanging must be enough to be able to tie it into a slipknot.
- **Rabbah** said in the name of **Rav**, the string that is wound around the others counts towards the number of required strings. **R' Yosef** said, it was **Shmuel** who said that, not **Rav**.
 - We have also learned that **Rabbah bar Chana** said that **R' Yoshiya of Usha** said in the name of **Shmuel**, the string that is wound around the others counts towards the number of required strings.
- **Rabbah** said in the name of **Shmuel**, if the techeiles was wrapped around most of the tzitzis (instead of only 1/3, as one should do) it is valid. **R' Yosef** said, it was **Rav** who said this, not **Shmuel**.
 - We have also learned that **R' Huna bar Yehuda in the name of R' Sheishes in the name of R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, if the techeiles was wrapped around most of the tzitzis it is valid.
 - **R' Chiya the son of R' Nosson** had a version of this ruling which added that even if the techeiles was only wound around the others in one set (instead of the multiple sets of winding like we do), it is valid. The beautiful way to make tzitzis is to have it 1/3 braided and 2/3 as loose fringes.
 - **Q:** What is the proper size of one set of braiding? **A:** A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says enough for it to be wound around 3 times.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, one should not make less than 7 sets of winding, which would correspond to the 7 Heavens, and should not make more than 13 sets, which would correspond to the 7 Heavens and the 6 spaces between them.
- A Braisa says, the winding should begin with the white strings, based on the pasuk of “hakanaf”, and should end with the white strings, because they are considered to be more kadosh (since they are mentioned first in the pasuk) and we only move higher in kedusha, not lower.
- **Rav and Rabbah bar bar Chana** were sitting and a person walked by wearing a garment made fully of techeiles that had tzitzis that were fully wound, without anything loose left hanging. **Rav** said, the garment is nice, but the tzitzis are not (they are passul) and **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said, even the tzitzis are nice (they are valid). The machlokes is that **Rabbah bar bar Chana** holds that the pasuk says that a braid should be made but also says “psil” (a string). This teaches that the tzitzis may be made of either braids or loose strings. **Rav** says, the word “gedilim” comes to teach that 4 strings are needed, and therefore although it must be braided, there must also be loose strings hanging from it.
- **Shmuel** said in the name of **Levi**, white woolen tzitzis fulfil the chiyuv tzitzis in a garment of linen.
 - **Q:** Would white strings of linen fulfil the chiyuv in a woolen garment? Do we say that it is only woolen white strings in a linen garment that fulfil the chiyuv, because since the blue strings are made of wool the white strings can also be made of wool, but white linen strings would not fulfil the chiyuv in a woolen garment, or do we say that the pasuk says “tzemer upishtim yachdav” and then immediately says “gedilim taaseh lach” which teaches that woolen strings in a garment of linen, and linen strings in a garment of wool would both fulfil the obligation? **A:** We have learned that **Rachba in the name of R’ Yehuda** said, woolen strings fulfil the chiyuv in a linen garment and linen strings fulfil the chiyuv in a woolen garment. In fact, woolen and linen strings can fulfil the chiyuv in any garment, even in a silk garment.
 - The last part of the ruling argues on **R’ Nachman**, who says that silk garments are patur from tzitzis.
 - **Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, a Braisa says that silk is chayuv in tzitzis!? **R’ Nachman** said, that is only D’Rabanan. **Rava** asked, the Braisa says that one may use strings of wool and linen for tzitzis of a silk garment. Now, if it is chayuv D’Oraisa we can understand why shaatnez would be mutar, but if it is only chayuv D’Rabanan, how could shaatnez be mutar? **R’ Nachman** said, the Braisa means that he may use wool or linen. **R’ Nachman** said, the Braisa proves his view. The Braisa says that silk threads can fulfil the chiyuv in a silk garment. Now, D’Oraisa only strings of wool and linen can be used. The fact that strings of silk can be used proves that silk garments are only chayuv in tzitzis D’Rabanan.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may hold like the drasha of the pesukim by **Rava**, who darshens the pesukim to teach that tzitzis can either be made from the same material as the garment they are on, or they must be made of either wool or linen.
 - **R’ Nachman** holds like the **Tanna Divei R’ Yishmael**, which says that the pasuk regarding tzaraas teaches that whenever the word “begeg” is used, it refers to a garment of wool or linen. Therefore, regarding tzitzis, where the pasuk says that a “begeg” is chayuv in tzitzis, it is only garments of wool and linen that would need tzitzis D’Oraisa.
 - **Abaye** said, this **Tanna D’vei R’ Yishmael** argues with another **Tanna D’vei R’ Yishmael** which says that the word “**Oi** begged” written by tumas sheretz comes to include cloths made of materials besides wool and linen (e.g., camel hair, rabbit fur, goat hair, silk) and to teach that they are subject to tumas sheretz.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 70--40-----

- A Braisa says, with regard to a linen garment, **B”S** say it is patur from tzitzis (because it would be shaatnez, and they don’t darshen “simuchen” which is the drasha we use to teach that shaatnez is mutar for tzitzis) and **B”H** say it is chayuv. The halacha follows **B”H**. **R’ Eliezer bar R’ Tzadok** asked, if someone wears tzitzis in a linen garment in Yerushalayim he is looked at with wonder (because he is considered to be wearing shaatnez)!? **Rebbi** said, if **B”H** allow it, why did the people of Yerushalayim say it is assur? It is because the people are not knowledgeable, and if we permit shaatnez here, they would think that shaatnez is mutar in other places as well.
 - **Q: Rava bar R’ Chana** asked **Rava**, why did they deal with this problem by being mevatel the mitzvah of tzitzis? Why didn’t they instead have 10 Rabanan put tzitzis onto linen garments and go into the marketplace, which would publicize that it is only mutar in this circumstance? **A:** That would confuse the people even more, when they see Rabanan who are wearing shaatnez.
 - **Q:** Why didn’t they simply teach the halacha in the public drasha? **A:** The reason they were goizer is because they were concerned that people would dye wool blue using “kala ilan” (a blue dye from a tree) instead of from the “chilazon”, which would make the tzitzis passul, and which would therefore make the wearer of such blue strings tied to a linen garment as having been oiver shaatnez.
 - **Q:** Why would this improperly dyed blue string be any worse than a white string that was not dyed at all, and he should therefore be yotzeh!? **A:** Since it is possible to fulfill the mitzvah on the linen garment using linen strings, which would not necessitate the overriding of the issur of shaatnez, we do not allow for the overriding of the issur, as **Reish Lakish** has taught.
 - **Q:** Why couldn’t the **Rabanan** check the blue strings to make sure they were dyed with the chilazon, rather than be mevatel the mitzvah of using techeiles for linen garments? **A:** They were afraid that the wool that is dyed to test the blue dye would then be used for tzitzis, and that is passul, because it wasn’t dyed for the sake of the mitzvah.
 - **Q:** Why couldn’t they send out proclamations, stating that the wool used for the testing is passul for tzitzis? **A:** People don’t pay much heed to proclamations.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, in regard to eating chametz on Pesach, and regarding Yom Kippur, which carry the kares penalty, we rely on sending proclamations (if Beis Din decides to add a month to the year they inform all places by means of sending written proclamations), then we should certainly rely on them for a simple assei!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said that he said in Bavel and **R’ Zeira** said in EY, the reason is that the **Rabanan** were concerned that the person’s linen garment would rip near the corner and he would use threads to sew up the rip, and leave the threads hanging to be used as tzitzis and would then add techeiles strings. However, the strings that were left hanging from the sewing are not valid for tzitzis because of “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy”. Therefore, he would not be fulfilling the mitzvah of tzitzis and would be oiver the issur of shaatnez. **A2: R’ Zeira** said the concern was that a person would put the woolen strings on a linen garment that he would use at night (which is patur from tzitzis), and therefore would be oiver the issur of shaatnez.
 - **Rava** said that he said in Bavel and **R’ Zeira** said in EY, if a garment is made of cloth but its corners are made of leather, it is chayuv in tzitzis. If the garment is made of leather and the corners are made of cloth, it is patur. The reason is that the main part of the garment must be made of cloth. **R’ Achai** would follow the material of the corner.
 - **Rava in the name of R’ Sechora in the name of R’ Huna** said, if one put tzitzis on a three cornered garment and then made it into a four cornered garment and put tzitzis on the last corner, it is passul because of “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says that the “Chasidim Harishonim” would put on tzitzis as soon as they wove a garment of 3 etzba’os. That means they put on the tzitzis when there were only 2 corners!? **A:** The Braisa means that they put on tzitzis when they got within 3 etzba’os of completing the garment.
- **Q:** Do we really say there is a psul of “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy” with regard to tzitzis? **R’ Zeira** said that if new tzitzis is put onto a garment that already has tzitzis and the old tzitzis are then removed, it is valid based on these new tzitzis!? **A: Rava** said, since adding the new tzitzis at the time was “baal tosif”, it is not considered as if he put on the new tzitzis altogether. It is only considered as being put on when he removes the old tzitzis. That is why it is not passul as “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy”.
 - **R’ Pappa** asked, maybe when he put on the new tzitzis he intended to be mevateil the old tzitzis, in which case it is not baal tosif and is an act of putting on tzitzis, and since **R’ Zeira** says it is valid it must be that there is no psul of “taaseh v’lo min ha’asuy”!? Rather, we see that there is no such psul.
- **R’ Zeira in the name of R’ Masna in the name of Shmuel** said, there is no issur of kilayim on tzitzis even if it is on a garment that is patur from tzitzis.
 - **Q:** What is meant that the garment is patur? It can’t refer to a garment that is not the minimum size needed for the chiyuv of tzitzis, because a Braisa as explained by **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says that if a garment is small enough to be patur from tzitzis it would be subject to the issur of shaatnez!? **A:** Rather, it means that if one put tzitzis onto a garment that already had tzitzis, these superfluous tzitzis do not create a shaatnez violation.
 - **Q: R’ Zeira** already said this once when he said that if one puts on extra tzitzis and then removes the old ones it is valid!? **A:** He actually did not say this twice. One of these was inferred from the other.