Kankantom is what is called in Aramaic ḥarta de’ushkafei, a black dye used by shoemakers. Diftera is hide that was processed with salt and flour, but not with gallnuts. Neyar is known in Aramaic as mahaka, paper made from reeds.

§ It was taught in the mishna: He does not fulfill his obligation unless the Megilla is written in Ashurit. The Gemara explains the reason for this: As it is written concerning the Megilla: “According to their writing and according to their time” (Esther 9:27), i.e., the way it was originally written.

The mishna concludes: He does not fulfill his obligation unless the Megilla is written upon parchment and with ink.” The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this? The Gemara answers: It is derived by way of a verbal analogy between one instance of writing and another instance of writing. It is written here in the book of Esther: “Then Esther the queen, the daughter of Abihail, and Mordecai the Jew, wrote all the acts of power, to confirm this second letter of Purim” (Esther 9:29), and it is written there: “Then Baruch answered them: He pronounced all these words to me with his mouth, and I wrote them with ink on the parchment” (Jeremiah 36:18). Just as there the writing was with ink on parchment, so too here, a Megilla must be written with ink on parchment.

**MISHNA**

With regard to a resident of an unwalled town who went to a walled city, where the Megilla is read on the fifteenth of Adar, and conversely, a resident of a walled city who went to an unwalled town where it is read on the fourteenth, the following distinction applies: If he is destined to return to his original place, he reads it according to the halakha governing his own place, and if not, i.e., if he is not destined to return to his place, he reads with them, the residents of his current location.

Beginning from where must a person read the Megilla in order to fulfill his obligation? Rabbi Meir says: He must read all of it. Rabbi Yehuda says: He need read onlv

**BACKGROUND**

Processed with salt and flour — מַחְקַקָּא אָדָם: There were several methods used to process hides in ancient times. It appears that hide prepared for writing parchment was first processed with salt and then with a mixture of salt and other substances. The final step was to process it again with gall juice to prevent the ink from fading. Omera is a kind of parchment that was not fully processed.

Neyar, mahaka — נְיָיר, מַחְקַקָּא: The commentators disagree as to the meaning of these words. Some say that they are similar to modern paper (Rashî), and others say that it means parchment that was written on and then erased (Rab Natan Av HaRavhov; see Meiri). Still others explain that it is parchment that underwent only partial processing (Arukh).

Mabaka — מָבָא: According to the opinion that the reference is not to paper, it is apparently referring to what is called in other places matza, which is skin that is almost completely crude, meaning that it had its hair removed but was not properly processed with salt and gall.

**NOTES**

The commentaries disagree as to the meaning of these words. Some say that they are similar to modern paper (Rashî), and others say that it is parchment that was written on and then erased (Rab Natan Av HaRavhov; see Meiri). Still others explain that it is parchment that underwent only partial processing (Arukh).

Derived by verbal analogy between writing and writing — כְּתִיבָה עִמָּהֶן: The Rambam explains the Gemara’s discussion as follows: The Gemara later tells us that the Megilla is referred to as a book, meaning that it is similar in its halakhhot to a Torah scroll, and is also referred to as a letter. Consequently, it has some similarities to the halakhot pertaining to Torah scrolls and certain dissimilarities, and the Gemara finds it necessary to offer proofs with regard to various details of halakhot for writing a Megilla. The Gemara apparently concludes that with regard to issues relating to writing, such as the requirement for ink and parchment, the halakhot of a Torah scroll apply to the Megilla, and with regard to other matters it is considered only a letter, and the stringencies of the Torah scroll do not apply to it.
GEMARA Rava said: They taught the mishna that one who is destined to return to his own place reads according to the halakha governing his own place only with regard to one who is destined to return to his own place on the night of the fourteenth of Adar. But if he is not destined to return on the night of the fourteenth, although he does intend to return to his own place eventually, he reads with the residents of his current location. Rava said: From where do I say this? As it is written: “Therefore the Jews of unwalled towns, who dwell in the unwalled towns, make the fourteenth day of the month Adar a day of gladness and feasting” (Esther 9:19). Since it is already written: “The Jews of unwalled towns,” why do I need it to write further, “who dwell in the unwalled towns?” It comes to teach us this: That one who is in an unwalled town even for the day is also called one who lives in an unwalled town.

The Gemara asks: We have found proof for a resident of a walled city who is temporarily located in an unwalled town. But from where do we derive the opposite case, that one from an unwalled town who is temporarily in a walled city is governed by a similar halakha? The Gemara answers: It is based on logical reasoning: Since one who is in an unwalled town for the day is called someone from an unwalled town, so too, conversely, one who is in a walled city for a day is called someone from a walled city.

And Rava said further: Someone from a village, where the Megilla is read on the Monday or Thursday prior to Purim (2a), who went to a town, reads the Megilla with the residents of the town, even if he had already read it in his own place. He does so in all circumstances, whether or not he will be returning to his own village. The Gemara explains: What is the reason for this ruling? This village should actually have read at the same time as the residents of the towns, but the Sages showed leniency toward the people of the villages and allowed them to advance their reading of the Megilla to the previous day of assembly so that they would be free to supply water and food to their brethren in the cities on the day of Purim. This, however, applies only when the village is in his place, in the village, but when he is in a town, he is required to read like the residents of the town, and not like the villagers.

Abaye raised an objection to Rava from a baraita: A resident of a walled city who went to an unwalled town, in all circumstances, whether or not he will be returning to his own city, reads the Megilla according to the halakha governing his permanent place. The Gemara first questions the text of the baraita as it is currently worded: Can it enter your mind that the resident of a walled city always reads in accordance with the halakha governing his own place, even if he is currently situated in an unwalled town? But doesn’t the matter depend on whether or not he will be returning on Purim to his hometown, as stated in the mishna? Therefore, it is clear that the baraita must be emended. Rather, is it not to be changed to: A resident of a village who went to an unwalled town? The baraita therefore teaches that a resident of a village who is visiting in a town must read the Megilla according to the halakha governing his own place, the village, unlike Rava’s teaching.

The Gemara rejects this: But did you not emend the reading in the baraita? Since you admit that the baraita in any event requires revision, change it further and teach: He reads the Megilla with the residents of the town. This wording in the baraita would then support the opinion of Rava.

They taught the mishna only with regard to one who is destined to return – י 실횤 ידיעין השעיך אל. There are two main approaches to understanding Rava’s statement. The discussion revolves around the question of whether or not Rava was specifically discussing residents of walled cities when he mentioned: The night of the fourteenth (Rashi), or referring to residents of both walled cities and unwalled towns (Rosh). Practically speaking, then, according to Rashi, the halakha depends on one’s intended location at the time they read in his own dwelling place; if he intends to be in his hometown on the day they read, he reads with them. If he intends to be in a different place at that time he should read in accordance with the halakha governing that different place. According to the Rosh, however, the halakha depends on one’s intended location on the fourteenth of Adar. Other early commentaries as well (Ran; Ritva) discuss these two approaches at length, as well as several approaches in between (Rabbi Zeraya Halevi; Ra’ava; Rashba). The opinions of the Rif and the Rambam are unclear, and are subject to much discussion (see Peni Megadim).

HALAKHA A resident of a town who went to a walled city – ברה קאא ק kzקן קען קך שליש קך קך - With regard to a resident of an unwalled town who went to a walled city or a resident of a walled city who went to an unwalled town, if he intends to return to his original place when the Megilla is read, he reads like the people of his place, even if he did not yet return. And if he does not intend to return by the time the Megilla is read, he should read in accordance with the custom of where he is presently, as the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rava. There is a fundamental dispute among the early commentaries with regard to the details of this halakha, and there are many variations within the main opinions. It appears that most of halakhic authorities follow Rashi’s interpretation of the passage (see Mishna Berura, Yemei Ha’Purim, and other contemporary sources).

If one leaves an unwalled town for a walled city on the fourteenth of Adar without intending to return shortly, he must read in both places (Mishna Berura, citing Vilna Gaon), though some dispute this (Kaf Ha’Hayim). Conversely, one who leaves a walled city on the fourteenth of Adar is exempt from Megilla reading in both places (Rena MilPano). All these opinions are based on the Jerusalem Talmud. It is also taught there that one who is traveling in a desert or on a ship reads the Megilla on the fourteenth of Adar, even if he lives in a walled city (Shuqan Arukh, Otsa Hayyim 688b, and in the comment of Rema).
Yisrael. He was a student of Rav Huna and apparently close to Rabbi Yehuda Nesia. The Talmud relates that Rabbi Yoĥanan said: And all of these tanna’im, in arriving at their respective opinions, were expounding the same verse. As it is stated: “Then Esther the queen, the daughter of Abihail, and Mordecai the Jew, wrote about all the acts of power to confirm this second letter of Purim” (Esther 9:28). The one who said that the Megilla must be read in its entirety interprets “acts of power” as referring to the power of Ahasuerus, and so the Megilla must be read from the beginning, where the power of Ahasuerus is recounted.

And the one who said that it needs to be read from “There was a certain Jew” explains that “acts of power” is referring to the power of Mordecai. And the one who said that it needs to be read from “After these things” maintains that “acts of power” is referring to the power of Haman. And the one who said that it needs to be read from “On that night” understands that the expression is referring to the power of the miracle, which began on that night when Ahasuerus could not sleep, and therefore one must begin reading the Megilla from there.

Rav Huna said: The four Sages derived their respective opinions from here: “Therefore, because of all the words of this letter, and of that which they saw concerning this matter, and that which had befallen them, the Jews ordained...that they would keep these two days” (Esther 9:16–27).

Rav Huna continued: The one who said that the Megilla must be read in its entirety explains the verse as follows: “They saw” refers to what Ahasuerus saw, in that he used the vessels of the Temple. Concerning this matter was because he had calculated seventy years from the Babylonian exile and the Jews were still not redeemed, and he consequently thought that they would never enjoy deliverance. And that which had befallen them is referring to the fact that he had killed Vashiti. Since the Megilla was written and continues to be read in order to inform future generations of all these events and what had happened to the people who were involved, and these are detailed at the beginning of the Megilla, it must be read in its entirety.

And the one who said that the Megilla must be read from “There was a certain Jew” interprets this verse as follows: That which Mordecai “saw” in that he acted so zealously concerning Haman. Concerning this matter was because Haman had made himself an object of idol worship. And that which had befallen them is referring to the fact that a miracle took place. Therefore one must read the Megilla from “There was a certain man,” where all this is recounted.

And the one who said that the Megilla needs to be read from “There was a certain Jew” interprets the verse in this way: That which Haman “saw” in that he became incensed with all the Jews. Concerning this matter was because Mordecai did not bow down, nor prostrate himself before him (Esther 3:2). And that which had befallen them is referring to the fact that he and his sons were hanged on the gallows (Esther 9:25). Accordingly, the Megilla must be read from the first mention of Haman.

And the one who said that it needs to be read from “After these things” interprets the verse in this way: That which Haman “saw” in that he became incensed with all the Jews. Concerning this matter was because Mordecai did not bow down, nor prostrate himself before him (Esther 3:2). And that which had befallen them is referring to the fact that he and his sons were hanged on the gallows (Esther 9:25). Accordingly, the Megilla must be read from the first mention of Haman.

And the one who said that the Megilla must be read from “On that night” offers the following explanation: That which Ahasuerus “saw” in that he commanded to bring the book of chronicles before him. Concerning this matter was because Esther had invited Haman along with him to the banquet she made. And that which had befallen them is referring to the fact that a miracle took place. And therefore one must read the Megilla from “On that night the king could not sleep and he commanded to bring the book of chronicles.”

Rabbi Helbo said that Rav Hama bar Gurya said that Rav said: The halakha is in accordance with the statement of the one who says that the Megilla must be read in its entirety. And moreover, even according to the one who said that it need be read only from “There was a certain Jew” and onward, the Megilla itself must nevertheless be written in its entirety.
And Rabbi Helbo said further that Rav Hama bar Gurya said that Rav said: The Megilla is referred to as a “book” (Esther 9:32), and it is also referred to as a “letter” (Esther 9:29). It is called a book, indicating a comparison to the book of the Torah, i.e., to a Torah scroll, to teach us that if one sewed its parchment sheets together with flax threads the Megilla is unfit, just as a Torah scroll sewn in this manner is unfit. And it is called a letter to teach us that if one stitched the Megilla sheets together with only three threads of sinew, in the manner of a letter, the Megilla is fit for use, as it does not have to be completely stitched like a Torah scroll. Rav Nahman said: This is true provided that the stitches are made in three parts.6

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: If one reads from a Megilla that was written together with the rest of the Writings he has not fulfilled his obligation, as it must be evident that one is reading specifically from the Megilla rather than simply reading ordinary passages from the Bible. Rava said: We said this only in a case where the parchment of the Megilla is not a little shorter or longer than the parchment of the other biblical books on the scroll and are consequently not plainly discernible among them. But if it is a little shorter or longer than the other sheets of parchment of the other biblical books, we have no problem with it, and one may read from such a scroll.

It was related that Levi bar Shmuel was once reading before Rav Yehuda from a Megilla

A Megilla that was written together with the rest of the Writings was fit: A Megilla that was written together with the rest of the Writings may not be read for the public, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan. Even after the fact, if one has read from such a text, he has fulfilled his obligation only if the parchment of the book of Esther is bigger or smaller than the other parchments of the scroll, so that it is distinguishable as an independent entity. However, a private individual may read from such a text and fulfill his obligation, provided it is written as a scroll, as opposed to bound books, which are common nowadays. Some say that an individual may read from such a scroll even ab initio (Vilna Gaon, citing Rash; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 691:6).

In three parts – There are several opinions with regard to the meaning of this expression. Rashi explains that it means that the stitches should be evenly spaced, i.e., that the distance from the edge of the sheet, both at the top and on the bottom, to the first stitch should equal the length of each stitch.

Another opinion is that the page should be divided into three equal parts, with one stitch per part (Rabbeinu Hananel). The Rambam’s opinion is that the Megilla should be stitched in three places, each stitched area itself consisting of three stitches. See HALAKHA.

In most cases one piece of hide is not enough to write an entire Megilla, and therefore several sheets of parchment must be attached together. The Sages taught that like the parchment itself, even the stitches must be from a material that comes from an animal, i.e., thin tendons that are made into strings and used to stitch. Since not all the stringencies of a Torah scroll apply to a Megilla, it is not required that one follow the halakhot of stitching a Torah scroll, and it is enough that it be sewn with only three stitches.

BACKGROUND

The stitches of the Megilla – The stitches of the Megilla sheets connected were taught by the Sages. A Megilla that is stitched with flax threads is unfit. However, it does not need to be stitched entirely like a Torah scroll; it is sufficient that it be stitched with sinews in three. Since there are several different interpretations of this expression, one should sew three stitches at the top, three at the bottom and three in the middle, and one stitch at the quarter mark from the top and another at the quarter mark from the bottom. If he has sufficient sinews to do so, he should stitch it entirely (Rema), but he should then leave a small space unstitched (Arukh HaShulḥan; Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 691:6, and in the comment of Rema).

In three parts – There are several opinions with regard to the meaning of this expression. Rashi explains that it means that the stitches should be evenly spaced, i.e., that the distance from the edge of the sheet, both at the top and on the bottom, to the first stitch should equal the length of each stitch. Another opinion is that the page should be divided into three equal parts, with one stitch per part (Rabbeinu Hananel). The Rambam’s opinion is that the Megilla should be stitched in three places, each stitched area itself consisting of three stitches. See HALAKHA.
Some of these reasons are: (1) Unlearned people may not realize the significance of the Megilla. They hit this halakha on its head, i.e., that the reading of the Megilla must be done publicly, so that the people can understand the biblical passages, the Gemara may be understood in its plain sense. (2) Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yohanan said: The halakha of leaving a space without stitches, i.e., that the parchment sheets of a Megilla scroll must not be sewn all the way to the edge, but rather a small margin must be left at the top and at the bottom, is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, i.e., it was not written in the Torah but was received in the framework of the Oral Law. But they immediately hit this halakha on its head, explaining that this halakha is not due to the special sanctity of a Torah scroll; rather, they said that it is only so that it not rip. If the scroll is wound too forcefully, the sheets of parchment will begin to spread apart since they are not sewn together at their extremities, and the one who is winding will cease to wind it so forcefully. If the stitching went all the way to the end there would be no such warning and the stitches would cause the parchment to rip.

Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba also said that Rabbi Yohanan said: Had there been left open a crack so much as the size of small sewing needle in the cave in which Moses and Elijah stood when God’s glory was revealed to them, as it is written: “And it shall come to pass, while My glory passes by, that I will put you in a cleft of the rock” (Exodus 33:22), and: “And he came there to a cave… and, behold, the Lord passed by” (1 Kings 19:9–11), they would not have been able to endure due to the intense light that would have entered that crack, as it is stated: “For no man shall see Me and live” (Exodus 33:20).

And Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba also said that Rabbi Yohanan said: What is the meaning of that which is written: “And the Lord delivered to me two tablets of stone written with the finger of God; and on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spoke with you in the mountain” (Deuteronomy 9:10)? This teaches that the Holy One, Blessed be He, showed Moses on the mountain all the inferences that can be derived from the words of the Torah; and all the inferences that can be derived from the words of the Scribes; the early Sages; and also all the new halakhot that the Scribes were destined to introduce in the future in addition to the laws of the Torah. And what is it specifically that the Scribes would introduce in addition to the laws of the Torah? The reading of the Megilla.

Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yohanan said: If one reads from a Megilla that was written together with the rest of the Writings he has not fulfilled his obligation. But they hit this halakha on its head, i.e., immediately after reporting this ruling they added a qualification that removed much of its force: “They taught this halakha only with respect to reading the Megilla for a congregation.” An individual who reads the Megilla in private fulfills his obligation even if the Megilla was written together with the rest of the Writings. Only when it is read in public must it be from a Megilla that is a separate scroll.

And Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba further said that Rabbi Yohanan said: Had there been left a crack… in the cave – what is the meaning of these concepts? When Moses was in the cave, God said, “And I will cover you with My hand until I have passed by” (Exodus 33:22), meaning that God blocked Moses’ vision so that nothing would be seen (Maharsha). See Guide of the Perplexed for an explanation of these concepts.

And on them was written according to all the words – the Gemara explains that this expression includes all the inferences that can be derived from the words of the Torah. This is based on the seemingly superfluous word “all.” And from the expression “according to all the words,” which in Hebrew could also mean “like all the words,” the Gemara derives that there are other halakhot like the words of the Torah, i.e., the new halakhot that the Scribes were destined to introduce in the future, such as the reading of the Megilla, in addition to the laws of the Torah (Maharsha).

The early and later commentaries discuss this principle at length. The Derashot Hallur explains that not only was the Torah given to Moses, but also all the various approaches of interpretation found in halakhic midrash and aggadic midrash, as well as the questions and dilemmas that the sages of future generations would raise. Although these matters are decided according to the opinion of the majority of sages in those generations, nevertheless all the concepts involved were shown to Moses, along with the stipulation that in all such disputes the majority opinion should be followed.
Everyone is fit to read the Megilla, except for a deaf person, an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda disagrees and says that a minor is fit to read the Megilla.

The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna that taught that the reading of a deaf person, even after the fact, no, it is not valid? Rav Mattana said: It is Rabbi Yosei, as we learned in a mishna elsewhere (Berakhot 15a): If one recites the Shema but does not make it audible to his ears, he has nevertheless fulfilled his obligation. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei said: He has not fulfilled his obligation. Rabbi Yosei’s statement implies that one who does not hear what he is saying does not fulfill his obligation. Presumably the halakhot for Shema recitation and Megilla reading are equivalent.

The Gemara questions the assumption on which the previous discussion is based: But from where do you know that the mishna, which states that a deaf person may not read the Megilla, reflects the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and that it means to say that even after the fact, no, one does not fulfill his obligation if the Megilla is read by a deaf person? Perhaps the mishna was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and it should be understood as saying that a deaf person may not read ab initio, but after the fact, his reading is valid.

The Gemara rejects this proposal: This should not enter your mind, as the mishna teaches the halakha of a deaf person, an imbecile, and a minor together, implying that a deaf person is similar to an imbecile or a minor. Therefore, it may be inferred that just as the readings of an imbecile and a minor are not valid even after the fact, so too, even after the fact, no, the reading of a deaf person is not valid.

The Gemara asks: But perhaps it is not so that all three cases are equivalent. Perhaps with regard to the imbecile and the minor, this halakha is as it is, and with regard to a deaf person, that halakha is as it is. Although all three cases are taught together, this may be merely because in all three cases he may not read ab initio; there may be a difference between them with regard to their status after the fact. It is possible that the mishna means that the reading of a deaf person is valid after the fact, and is citing the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara rejects this: It is impossible to say that the anonymous first tanna of the mishna is Rabbi Yehuda, as from the fact that the latter clause teaches: Rabbi Yehuda says that a minor is fit, it may be inferred that the first clause of the mishna was not taught by Rabbi Yehuda.

---

**NOTES**

Except for a deaf person: The deaf person mentioned here is different from the standard deaf-mute mentioned in every other place in the Talmud, as usually this term refers to someone who is incapable of both hearing and speaking. Such an individual is often classified along with an imbecile and a minor, under the assumption that his mental capacity is quite low due to his inability to communicate verbally.

The deaf person here, however, is able to speak, since he is capable of reading the Megilla. Consequently, he is considered to be on a par with hearing people. His only disability is that he cannot hear the words he says, as the Gemara discusses in detail.

The early commentators, and to an even greater extent the later commentaries, distinguish between a hearing person who did not make his voice heard because he did not speak loudly enough, as in the case of reciting the Shema, and a deaf person who does not have the ability to hear himself even if he speaks loudly. Some explain that the essence of the mitzva of Megilla is to read it, not to hear it, but the reading of an individual who cannot hear what he says is considered deficient (Sefat Emet).

In the Jerusalem Talmud, a different approach to the term deaf is presented. There it is stated that the deaf person in the mishna is a deaf-mute. Consequently, this term does not belong in the mishna at all, as a deaf-mute by definition cannot possibly read the Megilla (Rd). Despite the word’s irrelevance, it is mentioned here along with the imbecile and the minor only because these three terms are so often grouped together throughout the Talmud.

The opinion of Rabbi Yosei: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that the opinion of Rabbi Yosei is based on the verse: “And you will give ear to his mitzvot” (Exodus 15:26), indicating that all mitzvot that involve recitation must also include hearing.
The Gemara continues to ask: But perhaps the mishna in its entirety was taught by Rabbi Yehuda after all, but the first clause of the mishna was taught anonymously, whereas the latter clause was taught explicitly in the name of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara rejects this argument: Are the two parts of the mishna comparable, that they can be associated with a single Sage? The first clause of the mishna comes to disqualify the reading of a minor, whereas the latter clause comes to declare a minor fit. These two contradictory opinions therefore cannot be understood as the statement of a single Sage.

The Gemara asks: But perhaps the mishna in its entirety expresses the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda after all. And it is teaching the halakha concerning two different types of minors, and the mishna is incomplete, lacking some words of elaboration, and is teaching the following: Everyone is fit to read the Megilla except for a deaf person, an imbecile, and a minor. In what case is this statement said? Only with regard to a minor who has not reached the age of training in mitzvot. But a minor who has reached the age of training in mitzvot may read the Megilla even ab initio, as Rabbi Yehuda says that a minor who has reached that requisite age is fit to read the Megilla.

The Gemara raises a difficulty with this interpretation of the mishna: In what manner did you establish the mishna? You established it as being in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and you understand the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda to be that a deaf person is disqualified from reading the Megilla ab initio, but after the fact his reading is valid.

But then that which Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, taught will present a difficulty, as he taught a baraita: A deaf person who can speak but cannot hear may set aside teruma even ab initio, although he cannot hear himself reciting the blessing that is recited before setting aside teruma. Upon whose opinion is this baraita based? If you say it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, that cannot be, as you have established that Rabbi Yehuda maintains that if one recites something and does not hear it, after the fact, yes, his action is valid, but he should not do so ab initio. And if you say it is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, this is even more difficult, as he maintains that even after the fact, no, his action is not valid. Who, then, is the Sage who would say that a deaf person may set aside teruma even ab initio?

The Gemara rejects this reasoning: Rather, what then do you propose to say, that this baraita is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda and that Rabbi Yehuda permits a deaf person to read even ab initio, whereas Rabbi Yosei would disqualify him even after the fact? But then whose is the opinion that is represented in that which is taught in a baraita? A person should not recite the Grace after Meals in his heart; i.e., inaudibly, but if he recited it in this manner, he has fulfilled his obligation. It is the opinion of neither Rabbi Yehuda nor Rabbi Yosei. As, if it follows the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, it should be permitted even ab initio, and if it follows the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, then even after the fact, no, this should not be valid.

### HALAKHA

The Grace after Meals in his heart – יְבָרֵך רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּרֵישָׁא קָתָנֵי. One should recite all blessings loudly enough to hear them himself; however, after the fact, if he did not hear them, he has fulfilled his obligation (Rambam Sefer Aboth, Hilchot Berakhot 1:7).