

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Megila Daf 6
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
learntosfos.com
Subscribe free: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Daf 6a

R' Yochanan said: when I was young, I remembered what I asked an elder, and I found that he held like me. Chemes was Teveria. Why was it called 'Chemes?' Because of the Chamei Teveria, (i.e., the Teveria hot-springs). Rekes is Tzipoiri. Why was it called 'Rekes?' Because it's high like the river's Raksa (i.e., the river bank). Kineres is the city Ginisur. Why was it called 'Kineres?' Because its fruit is as sweet as the sound of a Kinur (i.e., violin).

Rava asks: is there anyone who holds that Rekes is not Teveria? After all, when someone dies here (in Bavel) they eulogize him there (in Teveria) “Bavel raised him, and they place him (for burial) in Rekes. When the coffin arrived there they eulogized: “lovers of Jews, those who live in Rekes; go out to meet those who died in the low area (i.e., Bavel). Also, when R' Zeira, (who lived in Teveria), passed away, a eulogizer said the following: Bavel gave birth to him, and the “land of the deer” (i.e., Eretz Yisrael that sometimes stretches like deer hide) raised Bavel's delight (since he moved there). Rekes should say “woe now” since it lost its dear vessel.

Rather, Rava says: Chamas is Chamei Grar, Rekes is Teveria and Kineres is Ginisar. Why is Teveria called 'Rekes?' Because, even the Reikanim (i.e., empty ones, i.e., empty from much Mitzvos) are still filled with a lot of Mitzvos like a pomegranate (is filled with seeds). R' Yirmiya says that its real name is Rekes. Why is it also called “Teveria?’ Since it sits in the Tibura (i.e., the naval, i.e., the middle) of Eretz Yisrael. Rabbah says that its real name is Rekes. Why is it also called “Teveria?’ Since its aspects are good. [**Tosfos explains: since they have gardens and orchards.**]

Zeira says: Kitron is Tzipoiri. Why is it called Tzipoiri? Since it sits on top of the mountain like a Tzipor (i.e., bird). The Gemara asks is Kitron really Tzipoiri? After all, we know Kitron was in the portion of Zevulon, as the Pasuk says “Zevulon did not conquer the inhabitants of Kitron, or of Nahalol.” Plus we see that Zevulon complained about his portion. As the Pasuk says “Zevulon was a people who shamed themselves to death.” Why is this? Since “Naftali was on the high places of the fields.” Zevulon said before Hashem “Master of the world! You gave to our brothers fields and vineyards, and You gave me mountains and hills. You gave our brothers land, and You gave me seas and rivers.” Hashem answered: “they'll all need you to provide them with the Chalazon.” As the Pasuk says: “the nations will gather to the mountain for the hidden treasures of the sand.” R' Yosef taught 'hidden' refers to the Chalazon; 'treasure' refers to the tuna fish; 'sand' refers to white glass. Zevulon complained: who will inform us (that we'll be reimbursed for them)? Hashem answered back: “there they will Shecht the righteous Korbanos.” This will be a sign to you that anyone who will take these items without reimbursement won't succeed in their trade at all.

Tosfos explains: since it refers to righteous Korbanos, and a stolen animal can't be a Korban. (So too, any Chalazon that's taken needs to be authorized by Zevulon.)

The Gemara concludes the question: if you think that Kitron is Tzipoiri, why were Zevulon upset? After all, Tzipoiri is a great place. If you will suggest that, perhaps, it doesn't have the flow of milk and honey, (but that's not true). As Reish Lakish said: I saw the flow of milk and honey of Tzipoiri and it was

sixteen Mil squared. If you suggest that it wasn't the same quality as the other Shvatim's share, (this also is not true). As Rabbah b. b. Chana quoted R' Yochanan: I saw the flow of milk and honey of the whole Eretz Yisrael and it was from the city of Bei Kubi until the city of Akra Tulbakni, which was twenty two Parsah long and six Parsah wide. (This implies that the quality was the same throughout the whole Eretz Yisrael.) The Gemara answers: still, the fields and vineyards were better. This is also inferred from the Pasuk "Naftali was on the high places of the fields." This is a proof.

R' Avahu says: "(the city of) Ikaran will be uprooted;" this refers to Caesaria that belonged to the children of Eisuv. It was situated in middle of the sand, and it was a peg stuck (in the side) of the Jews (i.e., they were trouble) in the days that the Greeks (ruled the Jews). When the Chashmanaim became victorious, they called it "the conquered city of 'Migdal Shir'."

R' Yossi b. Chanina says: what does the Pasuk mean "I will remove the blood from his mouth, and the disgust from between his teeth. It will remain to Hashem our G-d?" "I will remove the blood from his mouth," this refers to the Edomite idol 'Beis Bamyah.' "And the disgust from between his teeth," this refers to the Edomite idol 'Beis Gilyah.'. "It will remain to Hashem our G-d." refers to Shuls and Batei Midrashim that was built in Edom. "He'll be chief in Yehudah, Ikaran and Yerushalayim;" these are the theaters and circuses in Edom, where the princes of Yehuda will eventually teach Torah in public (when Moshiach comes).

Tosfos brings those who explain: these are houses of idol worshipers. The Jews changed their name to theaters that means shameful, and circus that means bathroom in Arabic.

However, Tosfos held this difficult that we'll allow Torah learning in these disgusting places. Rather, (the idol house) will remain desolate in the future. Our Gemara refers to the non-Jewish gathering places for council.

R' Yitzchok said: "Leshem" refers to the Babylonia area Pamayis. "(The city of) Ikaran will be uprooted;" this refers to Caesaria that belonged to the children of Eisuv, which was a king's metropolis. Some say (the reason it was called that) since kings were raised there. Others say that they appointed kings from there.

When referring to (the two cities) Caesaria and Yerushalayim; if someone tells you that they're both destroyed, don't believe him. If he says that they're both settled, don't believe him. If he says that Caesaria is destroyed and Yerushalayim is settled, or vice versa, you should believe him. As the Pasuk says "I'm filled, she laid waste." If this one is settled, the other one is destroyed, and vice versa. R' Nachman b. Yitzchok says: you learn that lesson from here; "one kingdom should be stronger than the other."

R' Yitzchok says: "you should give grace to the wicked, don't learn righteousness." Yitzchok (our forefather) asked Hashem to 'grace' Eisuv. Hashem responded (He can't) since Eisuv was 'wicked.' Yitzchok asked: is there nothing that you can say in his defense? Hashem answers: he will destroy Eretz Yisrael. So Yitzchok conceded: "thus, he shouldn't see the greatness of Hashem."

R' Yitzchok says: what does the Pasuk mean by; "Hashem, don't let the wicked get their desires, don't remove their bit, or let them exalt themselves forever." Yaakov said before Hashem "don't give the wicked Eisuv what his heart desires."

Daf 6b

“Don't remove his bit,” this refers to Geremia of Edom (that you need to guard the world from, like to have it tied down with its bit.) For, if they would ever become free, they would destroy the world. R' Chama b Chanina says: there are three hundred people with crowns in Geremia of Edom, and three hundred and sixty five commanders in Rome. They fight each other each day and kill one of them, and they become busy to appoint another king (for a replacement).

R' Yitzchok says: if someone tells you that he toiled (in Torah) but didn't reach (the goal of understanding the Torah), don't believe him. If he tells you that he hadn't toiled (in Torah) but reached (the goal of understanding the Torah), don't believe him. If he tells you that he toiled (in Torah) but reached (the goal of understanding the Torah), believe him. This is only regarding learning Torah, but regarding business, it all depends on Hashem's help (and not in how much he toiled). Also, when we say this regarding Torah, that's only to be sharp in understanding the Torah, but regarding retaining what you learned, it all depends on Hashem's help.

R' Yitzchok says: if you see a wicked person who's being prosperous at this time, don't start up with him, as the Pasuk says “don't start up with those who do bad.” Not only that, but his path will (continue) to prosper, as the Pasuk says: “he will win in his ways at all time.” Not only that, but he will be victorious in his judgment, as the Pasuk says “from high, his judgment will be before him.” Not only that, but he sees his enemies (downfall), as the Pasuk says “all their enemies will be blown down before them.”

The Gemara asks: didn't R' Yochanan quote R' Shimon b. Yochai; you may start up with the wicked in this world, as the Pasuk says “those who leave Torah will praise evil, and those who keep the Torah will start up with them.” We learned: R' Dustai b. Maton said: it's permitted to start up with the wicked in this world. If someone would whisper to you (as a rebuttal) that the Pasuk says, “don't start up with those who do bad and don't be envious of the evildoers.” However, (this doesn't refute it), but it only refers to someone who's bothered by his heart (who wants to join the wicked) that he shouldn't start with the wicked to be like them or envy the evildoers to be like them. As it says “don't let your heart be envious of the sins etc.”

The Gemara answers: it's not difficult; you shouldn't start up with them regarding your own business, but you may start up with them about Hashem's business (of Torah and Mitzvos). Alternatively, both can refer to your own business and it's not difficult, you can start up with them if you're a completely righteous man and you can't if you're an incomplete righteous man. As R' Huna says: what does the Pasuk mean by “why do you look at those who act wickedly and be quiet; when the wicked swallows up someone more righteous than him?” It means that he only swallows someone just more righteous than him, but not someone completely righteous. Alternatively, (usually a wicked person doesn't win a Tzadik), but it's different if the wicked person is at a time when he's prosperous.

Ulla says: Greek's Italy is a great city of Rome which covers three hundred Parsah squared. It has three hundred and sixty-five markets, like the days in a solar year. The smallest is the fowl market which is sixteen Mil squared. The king ate each day in one of them. Anyone who lived there, although he wasn't born there, received a portion of food from the king's house. Also, anyone who was born there, although he doesn't live there, received a portion of food from the king's house. There were three thousand

bathhouses with five hundred windows (openings of the smoke stacks) that bellows smokes (and are higher than the city walls) so the smoke should go out over the city's wall. One side of the city is open to the sea. Another side is open to the mountains and hills. Another side had an iron wall. Another side was open to small stones and traps.

New Sugya

If you read the Megila by the first Adar, and then Beis Din decided to make it into a leap year, you must read it again on the second Adar. There is nothing what was done on the first Adar that needs to be done on the second Adar besides reading the Megila and giving gifts to the poor.

The Gemara infers from here; the two months are the same regarding the reading of the four Parshiyos, (and if read on the first Adar, you don't need to read it on the second Adar).

Tosfos explains: if they read the four Parshiyos during the first Adar when they didn't realize yet that they need to make it into a leap year, and then they made it into a leap year, they don't need to reread them during the second Adar.

On that, the Gemara asks: which Tanna's opinion is this Mishna like? After all, it's not like any Tanna of the following Braisa; not like the Tanna Kama, not like R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi and not like R' Shimon b. Gamliel. As we learned: if you read the Megila on the first Adar, and then Beis Din decided to make it a leap year; Tanna Kamma holds that you read it on the second Adar too. Although all Mitzvos done during the second Adar can be done in the first Adar (and doesn't need to be repeated), reading the Megila is the exception. R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi says that you don't need to read it again on the second Adar since all Mitzvos done during the second Adar can be done in the first Adar. R' Shimon b. Gamliel quotes R' Yossi: you also need to repeat reading the Megila on the second Adar (besides repeating all other obligations) since all Mitzvos done during the second Adar can't be done in the first Adar. However, both months are the same regarding eulogizing and fasting, that they're forbidden (on the fourteenth and fifteenth) of both Adars.

The Gemara asks: it seems that the Tanna Kama and R' Shimon b. Gamliel are identical, (so what are they arguing about?) The Gemara answers: they're arguing whether they need to repeat the four Parshiyos. After all, the Tanna Kama says that you should L'chatchila do everything in the second Adar, however, if you already did it in the first Adar you're Yoitza except for reading the Megila, where, even if you already read it in the first, you still need to repeat it in the second Adar. R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi held that you can even read the Megila L'chatchila on the first month.

Tosfos explains (how we know that R' Elazar holds you can read it L'chatchila during the first Adar): we learn this from an extra line in the Braisa "all Mitzvos that you do during the second Adar, you do during the first." This implies that you can L'chatchila do it during the first.

There are those who are accustomed to make the fourteenth and fifteenth of Adar Rishon into a day of feasting and joy. The Mishna, at first glance, seems to support this. After all, it says that the difference between the two months is reading the Megila and giving the poor's gifts. This implies that they're the same regarding feasting and joy.

However, it seems that this is not true. After all, the Gemara makes the implication that they're the same regarding that you can't eulogize or fast. This implies that they're not the same regarding partying and joy. You can't say they're dependent on each other (i.e., if you're obligated not to eulogize and fast, you need to feast and have joy). After all, if so, then the Gemara should have said that they're the same regarding feasts and joy and we would know that you can't eulogize, since the (majority of) days that are brought in Megilas Taanis that we can't eulogize don't have an obligation to feast and have joy. (So, no eulogizing doesn't necessarily include feasting, while, feasting would include that you can't eulogize.) Thus, the Halacha is that you don't need to be stringent to make a feast and have joy by Adar Rishon.

R' Shimon b. Gamliel held that even regarding reading the four Parshiyos; if you read it during the first Adar, you need to repeat it on the second Adar.

The Gemara now explains its statement that our Mishna can't be like all three Tannaim. After all, if it's the Tanna Kama, then it wouldn't fit what the Mishna said about gift's of the poor (that it needs to be given in the second Adar, and the Tanna Kama holds that everything can be done in the first except Megila). If it's R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi; then it's even difficult that the Mishna makes you read over Megila (on the second Adar). If it's R' Shimon b. Gamliel; the four Parshiyos are difficult (since the Mishna allows it on the first Adar, and R' Shimon Gamliel holds it must be repeated on the second Adar).

The Gemara answers: really, it's the Tanna Kama. Although he only said that you only repeat reading the Megila, he also means that you must also redo giving the poor's gifts since the two (Megila and gifts) are dependent on each other (and the time for one is automatically time for the other).

Alternatively, our Mishna is R' Shimon b. Gamliel, but it's missing some words. This is how it should be read: There is nothing different than the fourteenth of the first and second Adar but reading the Megila and giving the poor's gifts. This implies that they're the same regarding eulogizing and fasting. Therefore, the Mishna doesn't refer at all about the four Parshiyos (since they don't take place on the fourteenth).

R' Chiya b. Avin quoting R' Yochanan: the Halacha is like R' Shimon b. Gamliel who quoted R' Yossi. R' Yochanan said that they both learn their opinions from the same Pasuk. The Pasuk says "like every year and year" R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi says: just like every other year that you read on the Adar that's next to Shvat, so too (by the leap year), you read it on the Adar next to Shvat. R' Shimon b. Gamliel says: just like every other year that you read on the Adar that's next to Nisson, so too (by the leap year), you read it on the Adar next to Nisson.

The Gemara asks: I understand why R' Eliezer b. R' Yossi holds his opinion, since it's (better to read it earlier) since we don't pass over Mitzvos.

Tosfos asks: this Gemara is difficult to what we say in Zevachim that we pour the leftover blood (that we sprinkle in the Heichel) at the base of the western side of the Mizbeiach from the Pasuk of "the base of the Mizbeiach which you bring the Olah [i.e, the outside Mizbeiach] (where you go out" that you pour it on the western side, the side that's by the opening of the Heichel). [According to our Gemara], why do we need the Pasuk? Why don't we know this from

the fact that you can't pass over a Mitzvah, and since the first side that you reach when you leave the Heichel is the west, (you should put the blood there anyhow)?

Tosfos bring those who want to answer: we only say that you don't pass over a Mitzva when you have two Mitzvos to do, so, you do the nearer one first. However, this can't be since our Gemara only refers to one Mitzva, still, we apply the logic that you can't pass over Mitzvos.

R' Yehuda answers: if it wasn't for the Pasuk, I would have thought that the logic is that you don't pass over the Mitzva L'chatchila, but B'dieved, (if you spill the blood on any other side), you're Yoitza. So the Pasuk teaches us that you're not even Yoitza B'dieved.

Alternatively, from the logic that you can't pass over Mitzvos, we would only know to place it on the western side of the Mizbeiach, but not necessarily on the base. So, the Pasuk teaches us that you need to place it on the base. *[See Turei Even who asks that the Drasha also teaches us about the west, since the Pasuk needed to tell us to pour it at the place you walk out.]*

However, why did R' Shimon b. Gamliel picked his opinion?

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."