

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Megila Daf 7
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
learntosfos.com
Subscribe free: tosfosproject@gmail.com

R' Tavi answers: he holds that it's better to make the redemption (of Purim) next to the redemption (of Pesach). R' Elazar answers: since the Pasuk says “to keep this letter of Purim, the second one.”

Daf 7a

The Gemara continues: we need both the Pasuk of “the second one” and the Pasuk of “every year and year.” If it only wrote “every year and year” I might have thought like our question (that you should say it refers to the Adar closest to Shvat since you're not pushing off a Mitzva), therefore, it says “the second one”). If it only said “the second one,” I would have said to, L'chatchila, read it on the first and second Adar, so we're taught otherwise from “every year and year” (that you only read it once).

The Gemara asks: what does R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi learn from the Pasuk of “the second one?” The Gemara answers: he needs it for the statement of R' Shmuel b. Yehuda: originally, they established Purim for Shushan, and only established it later for the rest of the world. (Thus, “the second one” refers to establishing Purim for everyone.)

R' Shmuel b. Yehuda says: Esther sent to the rabbis “establish (my miracle) as a holiday for all generations.” The rabbis sent back “(by this), you'll bring the non-Jews to hate us (by celebrating the downfall of non-Jews).” She sent back “I already wrote the story in the chronicles of Madai and Persia, (so it's too late since it will be known to non-Jews permanently).

Rav, R' Chanina, R' Yochanan and R' Chaviva taught, (and some say that, whenever this lists of rabbis appear in Moed, we should insert R' Yonasan instead of R' Yochanan): Esther sent to the rabbis: write for me (my story that it should be in Tanach) so it should be around for generations. They sent back:: the Pasuk says “I wrote for you in threes,” there should only be three (Parshos of Amaleik) and not four. (So, since there are already three Parshiyos; one in Bashalach, another in Ki Seitzei and a third in Shmuel, you can't have any more). They held this way until they saw the Pasuk “write this as a remembrance in the Sefer.” “Write this” what it says here (in Shemos) and what it says in Sefer Devarim (i.e., we'll consider all that's written in the Torah as one). “Remembrance” refers to what's written in the Navi. “In the sefer” refers to what's written in the Megila.

The Gemara says: this is dependent on the following Tannaic argument: R' Yehoshua says: “write this” what it says here (in Shemos). “Remembrance” refers to what's written in Sefer Devarim. “In the sefer” refers to what's written in the Navi. R' Elazar Hamodia says: “write this” what it says here (in Shemos) and what it says in Sefer Devarim (i.e., we'll consider all that's written in the Torah as one). “Remembrance” refers to what's written in the Navi. “In the Sefer” refers to what's written in the Megila.

R' Yehuda quotes Shmuel: (the rabbis decreed that any book of Tanach makes your hands Tamai [in order to discourage putting Truma with them, (which people did since they're both holy), which will attract mice that will damage the Sefarim.]) However, the book of Esther (i.e., the Megila) doesn't make

hands Tamai. The Gemara asks: does this mean that Shmuel held that the Megila wasn't written with Ruach Hakodesh (and is a regular book and not part of Tanach)? (But that can't be true) since Shmuel (brought later) says that it was written with Ruach Hakodesh. The Gemara answers: (Shmuel holds) the Megila was composed to be read by heart, but wasn't composed to be written (like all other books of Tanach).

Tosfos implies from this that you may read the Megila by heart (i.e., not from a Kosher Megila).

Tosfos asks: how can Shmuel argue with an unnamed Mishna that says; if you read it by heart, you're not Yoitza? Also, we see Rav says later that you need to write the Megila and sew (the pages of parchments together) with sinew. R' Yochanan also says: if you read a Megila that's written among other Sefarim in Kesuvim, you're not Yoitza.

Therefore, Tosfos explains: it wasn't given to be written when it was given over through Ruach Hakodesh, but the rabbis later enacted to have it written and read from.

Tosfos asks that it's still difficult: the Gemara says in Yuma; Esther is similar to the dawn; just like dawn is the end of the night, Esther is also the end of all miracles. The Gemara asks: but isn't there Chanuka (that came afterwards)? The Gemara answers: (it's the end of miracles) that were meant to be written. The Gemara asks: this only fits well to the opinion that you write it down, but not to those who say that it's not meant to write down. (So, if Shmuel holds that the Rabanan require you to write it down, why is it not considered “not meant to be written?”)

Don't answer: that the opinion that “it's supposed to be written” means that the rabbis enacted it (and the other opinion holds that even the rabbis didn't require writing in down) [Mahrsha- this is difficult, since we never find this third opinion that you don't need to write the Megila even rabbinically.] If so, we're back to “square one” in the question. After all, Chanuka also became rabbinically written down, i.e., in the Megilas Taanis.

R' Elchonon answers: the writing of the Megila is more official since it needs (its parchment paper) to be sewn together with sinew, and you need to scratch out lines on the parchment, and many other Halachos that you don't need for the writing down of Megilas Taanis.

The Gemara asks: R' Meir says that Koheles doesn't make hands Tamai. The argument between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel (whether a certain book is part of Tanach) was about Shir Hashirim. R' Yossi held that everyone holds that Shir Hashirim makes hands Tamai. R' Shimon says that Koheles is one of the cases where Beis Shammai is lenient and Beis Hillel is stringent (since Beis Shammai holds that it doesn't make hands Tamai and Beis Hillel says it makes hands Tamai). However, Rus, Shir Hashirim and Esther makes hands Tamai. (Therefore, everybody holds that Esther is part of Tanach).

The Gemara answers: Shmuel holds like R' Yehoshua (who held earlier that the three times that we can mention Amaleik in Tanach was taken up without the Megila, so they couldn't introduce the Megila into Tanach).

We learned: R' Shimon b. Menasia says; Koheles doesn't make hands Tamai (since it's not written with Ruach Hakodesh and is not part of Tanach) since it's only Shlomo's wisdom. The rabbis answered

him: are these the only wise words he said (to say that these are just his regular wise sayings?) Doesn't it say "he spoke three thousand parables." Also, it says "don't add on to his words (because these are special)." The Gemara asks: why do we need this second proof of "don't add on to his words?" The Gemara answers: I might have thought that Shlomo had many wise sayings, and if you want, you may write them down, and if you want, you don't write them down. (Thus, Koheles is only a partial collection of Shlomo's wise sayings.) Therefore, we bring the Pasuk "don't add on to his words," (that these are the special ones said with Ruach Hakodesh, and you can't add any other statement to it.)

We learned: R' Eliezer said: the Megila was written with Ruach Hakodesh. After all, it says "and Haman said in his heart," (and the only way they knew what was going on in his heart is with Ruach Hakodesh.) R' Akiva says: the Megila was written with Ruach Hakodesh as the Pasuk says; "Esther had grace by all who saw her." (How could this be known that everybody found grace in her without Ruach Hakodesh.) R' Meir says: the Megila was written with Ruach Hakodesh from the Pasuk "the (plot) was known to Mordichai. (How would the plot be known if it wasn't for Ruach Hakodesh.) *[The Turei Even asks: although this proves that Mordichai was a Navi, how does it prove that the whole Megila was written with Ruach Hakodesh? The Yaaros Devash answers: as we say that Moshe wrote a small Aleph by Vayikra, because he was too humble to write that Hashem called out to him. So too here, if Mordichai was writing the Megila by himself, he wouldn't have written that he had Ruach Hakodesh if it wasn't that Ruach Hakodesh was dictating him to write it.]* R' Yossi b. Durmsakis says: the Megila was written with Ruach Hakodesh, as it says "they didn't take any of the loot." (How can they know that nothing in the whole kingdom was not taken if it wasn't for Ruach Hakodesh.)

Shmuel said: if I was there, I would have given a better answer than all of them. As the Pasuk says "established and accepted" and we Darshen that they established above (in heaven) what they accepted below (on earth). (I.e, heaven agreed to the rabbis' establishment of Purim, and that can't be known if it wasn't for Ruach Hakodesh.)

Rava says: all the other answers have a disproof except for Shmuel. After all, for R' Eliezer's proof (that they knew what Haman was thinking) can be disproved (since it was obvious). It's obvious that he thought Achashveirosh was talking about him since there wasn't anyone more important to the king than him. So, that he was adding a lot of rewards, it's obvious he was doing it for himself. On R' Akiva's proof (that they knew that Esther had grace in everyone's eyes) can be disproved since everybody was trying to say that she was from their nation, (so everybody must have liked her). R' Meir's proof (that Mordichai knew about the plot) can be disproved like R' Chiya b. Abba who says that Bigsan and Seresh were Tersians (and Mordicahi understood their language and overheard their plot). On R' Yossi b. Durmsakis' proof (that they knew no loot was taken) can be disproved that they sent men to inform Mordichai and Esther about the facts. However, there is no disproof to Shmuel's answer. Raveina said: this is what people say; one sharp pepper is better than a basket full of gourds.

Tosfos asks: doesn't Shmuel also have a question? After all, Rava says in Mesechta Shabbos that this Pasuk teaches us that the Jews accepted the Torah (a second time by Purim). Therefore, we need this Pasuk for some other Drasha (and it's not necessarily saying Shmuel's Drasha).

Tosfos answers: this is not considered a question on it, since we can say that we can learn both Drashos from the Pasuk. Also, this is not similar to the other questions, since they completely disprove the logic of their statements.

R' Yosef says: we learn (that it was written in Ruach Hakodesh) from here “the days of Purim will never be lost by the Jews.” R' Nachman b. Yitzchok says: we learn (that it was written in Ruach Hakodesh) from here “its remembrance won't be forgotten from their children.”

Tosfos explains why R' Nachman b. Yitzchok doesn't learn like R' Yosef: the beginning of the Pasuk (“the days of Purim will never be lost by the Jews”) may be referring only to the Jews of that generation.

New Sugya

R' Yosef taught:: Mishalach Manos is (giving) two portions (of food) to one person. Matanos L'evyonim is two gifts to two poor people (one gift each). R' Yehuda Nisiah sent R' Oshiya the side of calf (that was the third born to its mother, which is the most tender) and a jug of wine. They sent back “our master was Yoitza Mishalach Manos.”

Daf 7b

Rabbah sent through Abaya to Mari b Mar a sack full of dates and a cup full of toasted flour. Abaya told him: Mari will say to this “if you appoint a villager to be a king, the basket he used to wear around his neck will not come down.” (I.e., that Rabbah, even after he became a Rosh Yeshiva, sends regular items.) Then he sent a sack full of ginger and cup full of long peppers. Abaya told him: Mari will say to this “I sent him sweet items, why is he sending me sharp items.”

Abaya said: when I left Rabbah's house, I was full. When I got to Mari's house, he presented me with sixty plates full of sixty types of dishes. I ate sixty pieces of it. The last one was pot roast and (it was so good) I wanted to chew the plate afterwards. Abaya says: this is like what people say “a poor man is starving and doesn't know it.” Alternatively, (it's like what people say) “there's always room for sweet tasting food.”

Abaya b. Avin and R' Chanina b. Avin exchanged meals (**Rashi- each year, they took turns eating by the other.**) Rava says: a person is obligated to drink on Purim until he doesn't know the difference between “cursed is Haman” and “blessed is Mordichai.”

Tosfos quotes the Yerushalmi: (you need to also say) cursed is Zeresh, blessed is Esther, cursed is all the wicked and blessed is all the Jews.

Rabbah and R' Zeira had the Purim meal together. They got drunk and Rabbah Shechted R' Zeira. The next day, Rabbah prayed for mercy and R' Zeira was revived. The next year, Rabbah said “let us dine the Purim meal together.” R' Zeira declined saying: “miracles don't always happen.”

Rava says: if you eat the Purim meal at night, you're not Yoitza. Why is this? Since it's called “the day of feast and joy.” R' Ashi was sitting before Ameimar. It was getting late and the rabbis weren't coming to hear the lecture. Ameimar asked: why weren't the rabbis coming? R' Ashi answered: perhaps they're busy preparing the Purim meal. He asked back: but they could have eaten the meal the night before. He

answered: didn't you hear Rava's statement "if you eat the Purim meal at night, you're not Yoitza." he answered back: teach it to me forty times and it will be compared as if I pocketed it.

New Sugya

There is no difference between Yom Tov and Shabbos but the ability to do Melacha to prepare food, (which is permitted on Yom Tov and forbidden on Shabbos).

Tosfos explains: it means that there is no Melacha forbidden on Shabbos that's not forbidden on Yom Tov but food preparation. However, of course, there are other things between them, that the punishment for transgressing Shabbos is stoning, and Yom Tov is only a regular Lav.

The Gemara infers from this that they're the same regarding doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food. Therefore, the Mishna is not like R' Yehuda. As we learned: the Tanna Kama says that there is no difference between Yom Tov and Shabbos but the ability to prepare food. R' Yehuda says that even doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food.(is permitted on Yom Tov). What is the reason for the Tanna Kama? Because the Torah says "it (i.e., Melacha for preparing food) is permitted" which excludes doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food. R' Yehuda learns from "for you" for all your needs (even doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food).

Tosfos points out: this infers that this is only a difference for preparing the utensils, but this is not a difference regarding preparing the actual food, and you may prepare it even if it was possible to prepare it from before Yom Tov. From R' Yehuda's opinion, we can deduce that the Rabanan agree to this since they only argue regarding preparing the utensils.

Tosfos asks: if so, the following Gemara in Shabbos is difficult: if someone milks, makes cheese, straining cheese from the whey, or harvests honeycombs; if he mistakenly did it on Shabbos, he's obligated to bring a Chatos. If he purposely did it on Yom Tov, he gets Malkos. So, you get Malkos for doing those Malachos despite that they're preparing for food. Even according to the Rabanan there who said that all those Melachos are only forbidden from the Rabanan, they would admit that he would get Malkos if it was a true Melacha.

Tosfos answers: you're allowed to make actual food preparation on Yom Tov, (despite that you were able to do it yesterday), where the food will deteriorate if done yesterday. However, food preparation that's better when done yesterday, like the cases in the Gemara in Shabbos, you can't make it on Yom Tov. However, preparing the utensils which don't deteriorate if done the day before, you can only differentiate between if he was able to do it the day before or not.

[See Maharsha. However, the Tiferes L'Moshe who explains: once the Torah permits preparing food, and most foods that's made before Yom Tov will deteriorate, so the Torah permits it completely even if it doesn't deteriorate, as long as it was not better if made before Yom Tov. However, for preparations for utensil, that doesn't deteriorate, then we say that the Torah only permits it if it was impossible to do the day before.]

The Gemara asks: what does the Tanna Kama learn from “for you?” For you only, and not for the use of non-Jews or animals. The Gemara asks: what does R' Yehuda do with the Pasuk 'it?' He understands that it's an apparent contradiction in the Pasuk. It says 'it' (to exclude doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food) and it says “for you” (to include doing Melacha to prepare utensils that are used in preparation of food). We need to reconcile it: we permit doing Melacha to prepare utensils (that are used in preparation of food) for those that couldn't have been done before Yom Tov and forbid those Melachos that can be done before Yom Tov.

New Sugya

There is no difference between Shabbos and Yom Kippur but that the punishment for purposely transgressing Shabbos is given over to people (i.e., Beis Din executes him), and the punishment for purposely transgressing Yom Kippur is Kareis.

The Gemara infers from this: they're the same regarding (you're exempt) from paying (when damaging at the same time as doing the Melacha, since the Torah says that you can't get two punishments, death and payment, for the same act.) Who is the Mishna like (that you're exempt from payment even though there is no death penalty in Beis Din)? It's like R' Nechunia b. Hakana. As we learned: R' Nechunia b. Hakana says that Yom Kippur is like Shabbos regarding (being exempt) from payment. Just like Shabbos, since you transgressed something that brings the death penalty, you're exempt for paying, the same for Yom Kippur, since you transgressed something that brings the death penalty, (albeit from heaven and not from Beis Din), you're exempt from paying.

We learned: R' Chanina b. Gamliel said; all people who transgress a sin that's punishment is Kareis, and received lashes for that sin, it exempts them from their Kareis. As the Pasuk says “you embarrass your brother (by lashing him) before your eyes.” As soon as you lashed him, he becomes your brother again (i.e., he's forgiven).

R' Yochanan says: the colleagues of R' Chanina b. Gamliel argued with him (on this point). Rava quoted Bei Rav: our Mishna says “there is no difference between Shabbos and Yom Kippur but that the punishment for purposely transgressing Shabbos is given to people (i.e., Beis Din executes him) and the punishment for purposely transgressing Yom Kippur is Kareis.” If it would be true (that you can give lashes to someone that has Kareis and will remove the Kareis, then both have their punishments from the hands of people.

R' Nachman answers: the author is R' Yitzchok who holds there is no lashes for sins that's punishment is Kareis. (However, all who say that you can lash someone who has Kareis would agree that the lashes remove the Kareis), as we learned: R' Yitzchok says; Kreises is included (i.e., the Kareis of having relations with a sister is included with all the other Ariyos, which the Torah sums them all up that you get Kareis for any of them). Why does the Torah write a specific Kareis by relations with a sister? To say Kareis only applies to it, and not lashes.

Tosfos brings Rashi: (a sister) is included in the general “the souls that did these things will get Kareis (by all the Arayos).

However, Tosfos asks: the Gemara should have said “a sister is included,” i.e., in the statement of “the souls that did these things will get Kareis” and didn't need to say that its Kareis (is included, since that's what the Pasuk is talking about).

Tosfos answers: those who are supposed to get Kareis is included, i.e., they're included in those who should get Malkos, since each one has a Lav. Why does the Pasuk need to say a special Kareis regarding a sister without writing it with a Lav? It's coming to teach us that its punishment is only Kareis (and not Malkos). From there, it's taught to all other Kareis (that they don't get Malkos) like all other items that were in a general rule, (that, if the Torah takes something out of that regular rule to teach us a Chidush, it doesn't only teach it for itself, but that it should apply to the whole rule).

R' Ashi answers: we can even say our Mishna is the rabbis (who argue with R' Yitzchok. Granted that, if he received Malkos, he wouldn't get his Kareis) still, Shabbos' main punishment is through people, and Yom Kippur's main punishment is through Kareis.