

## **Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Megila Daf 3**

**By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz**

**learntosfos.com**

**Subscribe free: [tosfosproject@gmail.com](mailto:tosfosproject@gmail.com)**

### **New Sugya**

R' Yirmiya, or R' Chiya b. Abba, says; the letters “Menatzpech” (i.e., Mem, Nun, Tzadi, Peh and Chuf, which are written in two ways, depending if they're at the end of a word are not); this distinction was made by the Tzofim (i.e., prophets). The Gemara asks: (how can it be that the prophets change the way it was written by the giving of the Torah?) After all, the Pasuk says “these are the Mitzvos” which implies that no prophet can make any new Mitzva (like restructuring how to write letters in the Torah). Also, (how can you suggest that they didn't have these end letters when the Torah was given?) After all, R' Chisda says that the (end) Mem and Samech in the Luchos stood through a miracle (since they're closed on all sides and the writing was engraved through the whole rock, the rock in the middle of these letters miraculously floated in the air.)

**Tosfos explains: this question assumes that (the letters originally were always written like they're written in the beginning of a word) and the prophets added the way they're written at the end.**

**Tosfos asks: the Gemara in Shabbos implies the opposite: as it says; I understand why, if the word needs a regular letter and you wrote it as an end letter, (it's Kosher) since you made it better. (After all, the end letters were always around), as R' Chisda says etc. (that the rock in the middle of the end Mem in the Luchos floated miraculously.) However, if you need an end letter and you wrote a regular letter, why is it Kosher if you're downgrading them? After all, R' Yirmiya says (the regular letters of) “Minatzpech” were instituted by the prophets.**

**The Ri answers: the Gemara in Shabbos implies that the Gemara was originally aware of R' Chisda's words (about the end Mem in the Luchos, so it couldn't suggest that the prophets made up the end letters). Also, since the Gemara started (with the Braisa that a regular letter made into an end letter is Kosher, and was dealing with whether you can apply it to the opposite case, where an end letter was written like a regular letter), therefore, it had to assume that the prophets made up the regular letters (or else, if it refers to end letters, we should extrapolate that end letters that was written as regular letters is Kosher from a Kal V'chomer from the given case of regular letters written as end letters). Therefore, the Gemara there is forced to explain that the prophets made up the Menftzech letters to mean the regular letters not to conflict with R' Chisda.**

**However, here, (the Gemara can be noncommittal what they made up). Therefore, it starts with the question from “these are the Mitzvos” (that you can't change any Mitzva), which is a question whether it refers to regular letters or end letters. Then it asks another question on the side that they made up the end letters, you will have a question on R' Chisda's statement, that the Mem and the Samech was a miracle (in the Luchos, so they had the end letters when the Torah was given).**

**We see that R' Tam held similarly; he starts out explaining in his Sefer Hayashar; the Tzofim made up Minatzfech: Tzofim are prophets as it says “the voice of your Tzofim (prophets).” It also says “the Tzofim from the mountains of Ephraim,” these were from the two hundred prophets that Hashem set up for the Jews after Amon burned the Torah. This is the**

reason he called the letters “Minatzfech” (although it's not in Aleph Beis order) since it's a play on words for Tzofim.

Then he explains the Gemara's questions: doesn't it say “these are the Mitzvos etc.” Also, didn't R' Chisda says that the Mem and Samech in the Luchos etc.” Which the Gemara answers: both were around etc. Therefore, it's not difficult to say that R' Yirmiya's statement (that the prophets made up Menatzphech) refers to end letters (despite them being around by the giving of the Torah.) I.e., when they came to Mesechta Megila, the Gemara asks from R' Chisda (assuming that R' Yirmiya refers to end letters, and it didn't just abandon that assumption and answer that he refers to the regular letters) since it's the regular way of the Gemara to test every side and see if it's necessary to abandon it. It also asked from “these are the Mitzvos” (not to change it), and ended up answering satisfyingly.

This, from both Sugyos (Shabbos and Megila), it would seem that R' Yirmiya said that the prophets made up Minftzech refers to both regular and end letters, as the Gemara concludes (that they were both there in the beginning, but they forgot which were only at the end and which were regular).

### Daf 3a

The Gemara answers: they had both types of letters, but they didn't know which one comes in the middle of a word and which one comes at the end. So, the prophets came along and enacted to put the regular letters in the middle and the “end letters” for the end. The Gemara asks: it's still a problem from “these are the Mitzvos” that a prophet can't innovate. The Gemara answers: they forgot where the letters go, and the prophets reminded us where they were originally situated.

### New Sugya

R' Yirmia, or R' Chiya b. Abba, said: Unkolus wrote the Targum of the Torah from what he received from R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua. Yonason b. Uziel wrote the Targum for the Navi from a tradition from Chagai, Zecharia and Melachai. When he did, the whole four hundred Parsah square of Eretz Yisrael trembled. A heavenly voice spoke: who is this who reveals my secrets to people? Yonason b. Uziel stood on his feet and said: I am the one who revealed your secrets to people. It is revealed and known before you that I didn't do this for my own honor or for the honor of my father's house. Rather, I did this for Your honor so that Jews shouldn't have too many arguments (on the explanation of the P'sukim). He wanted to reveal the Targum of Kesuvim. A heavenly voice came down and said: it's enough. Why (was it so against the idea)? Since, (in Daniel), it talks about the time of “the end,” i.e., when Moshiach comes.

We said that Unkolus wrote the Targum for the Torah. Is this true? After all, R' Ika b. Avin quote R' Chananel who quoted Rav: what does the Pasuk mean by “they read the Sefer Torah of Hashem that's explained. Apply your logic and understand the scriptures.” “They read the Sefer Torah of Hashem” refers to scriptures. “That's explained” refers to Targum. “Apply your logic” refers to the punctuation. “Understand the scriptures” refers to the Trup, or to the tradition (where words are written and read differently). [So, we see they had the Targum long before Unkolus.]

The Gemara answers: they forgot the Targum, so Unkolus needed to reconstruct it.

The Gemara asks: what's the reason that the land didn't shake for the writing of the Targum of the Torah, but only for the writing of the Targum of Navi? The Gemara answered: the Torah is self explained, while by the Navi, only some things are self explained, but others are not. As by the Pasuk "on that day, there was a big eulogy in Yerushalayim, just like the eulogy of Haddrimon in the Migidon valley." On that, R' Yosef says: if it wasn't for the Targum of that Pasuk, we wouldn't have an idea what it's saying. As the Targum says: "on that day, they'll have so much eulogizing just like they eulogied Achav b. Imri when Haddrimon b. Tavrimon in Ramot Gilad, and like the eulogies of Yoshia b. Amon who the lame Pharaoh killed in the Migidon valley.

### **New Sugya**

There is a Pasuk in Daniel: "I, Daniel, saw the vision myself, but the people with me didn't see it, but a great fear fell on them and they ran away into hiding." Who were those people with him? R' Yirmia, or R' Chiya b. Abba, said: it was Chagai Zecharia and Melachai. They were greater than him (in one aspect) and he was greater than them (in another aspect). They were greater than him since they were prophets and he wasn't. He was greater than them since he saw this vision and they didn't. The Gemara asks: once they didn't see the vision, why did they become scared? The Gemara answers: although they didn't see it, their Mazal (guardian angel) saw it. Raveina says: from here we see; if someone suddenly get scared, even if he doesn't see anything to be scared about, it must be that his Mazal saw something. What's the fix (to save himself)? He should read Sh'ma. If he's in a soiled place, (where it's forbidden to read Sh'ma), let him jump four Amos away from his place. If not, say thus "there are fatter goats than me by the butcher," (so, whatever's after me should go after them instead).

### **New Sugya**

The Gemara asks: once we said earlier that we need the words "every country and country and every city and city" for a Drasha, we should assume the same by the words "every family and family." So, what does it come to teach us?

R' Yossi b Chanina says: it comes to include the families of Kohanim and Leviyim. They cancel doing the Avoda (in the Mikdash) to go listen to the Megila. As R' Yehuda quotes Rav: Kohanim cancel their Avoda, Leviyim cancel their (singing) on their platform, and the Yisraelim cancel their prayers by the Mamid and go listen to the Megila. We have a Braisa like that: Kohanim cancel their Avoda, Leviyim cancel their (singing) on their platform, and the Yisraelim cancel their prayers by the Mamid and go listen to the Megila.

**Tosfos asks: why do they need to cancel (the Avoda)? After all, they have many hours after the Megila reading that they may do the Avoda then.**

**Tosfos answers: since the time to do the Avoda is when it starts becoming light, but they delay it because of the Megila reading, we consider it (somewhat) a canceling it (since you cancel bringing it at the time you're first obligated).**

**Tosfos asks: why don't they first do the Avoda and then read the Megila afterwards by themselves?**

**Tosfos answers: it's better to be read with the whole congregation since it will be a greater publicizing of the miracle.**

The house of Rebbi relied on (this Halacha) to cancel the Torah learning so that they can go listen to the Megila. After all, we can deduce it from a Kal V'chomer from the Avoda in the Mikdash. Since Megila cancels the Avoda in the Mikdash which is greater, of course you cancel the lesser Torah learning.

The Gemara asks: is it true that the Avoda in the Mikdash is greater than learning Torah? After all, the Pasuk says "It was, when Yehoshua was in Yericho, he lifted his eyes and saw, and there was a man who stood before him etc. and he bowed to him. The Gemara asks: how can he do this? After all, R' Yehoshua b. Levi says that it's forbidden for a person to say Shalom to someone at night since we're afraid that he's really a demon.

**Riva explains: this only applies when they're outside the city, where it's common to have demons, like in the fields, and also by night. This fits well (according to where we can assume) Yehoshua was, that he was sieging the city in the fields far from the Jewish camp. However, if someone's in a place where humans are common, you don't need to worry (perhaps the person is really a demon). After all, if it wouldn't be true then, when someone is in a city at night and tells us to write a Get for his wife, how do we allow writing it? Let us be concerned it was truly a demon, and we shouldn't write it unless we notice it has a double shadow (a darker and lighter one, which is a sign that it's not a demon since they can only have one shadow). (After all, we know that we don't need to see this double shadow in this case), since the Gemara never asked to need (this sign) but by a person who fell into a pit (where demons may dwell).**

The Gemara answers: it was different since he said "I'm the angel of Hashem." The Gemara asks: perhaps he was lying and he was truly a demon? The Gemara answers: we have a tradition that the demons won't say Hashem's name in vain. The angel said "yesterday, you didn't bring the afternoon Tamid, and now (at night) you're not learning Torah." Yehoshua asked: for which one are you coming (to chastise me for)?

**Tosfos asks: why did they not bring the Tamid? After all, I can understand why they didn't learn, since all the Yisraelim were sieging the city, but why didn't the Kohanim bring the Tamid?**

**Tosfos answers: since the Aron Hakodesh wasn't in its proper place. As the Gemara in Eirubin says that the Kohanim carried the Aron (to war).**

**Tosfos asks: how does the Pasuk imply that they didn't bring the Tamid and didn't learn Torah?**

**Tosfos answers: it's hinted from what Yehoshua said "are you from us" which is hinting to Torah, as it says "Hashem commanded the Torah to us." He also said "or, are you from our enemies" which hints to Korbanos that save us from our enemies. (So, he's asking are you here because of the Torah or because of Korbanos?)**

The angel answered: I'm coming for now.

**Rivan explains: 'now' refers to Torah learning, as the Pasuk says “now, write for you this song (Torah).”**

So, right away, it says “Yehoshua spent the night in the depths..”

**Tosfos points out: it doesn't say this exactly in that Pasuk, (but it's a combination of two P'sukim). It says when they sieged Yericho “he spent the night within his people. When he sieged the city of Eye, it says “he went that night within the depths.” This is the way of the Gemara to abbreviate P'sukim and to combine them. As, for example, the Gemara in Eiruchin combine the Pasuk “he gave money and it became his.”**

**Daf 3b**

R' Yochanan says: this teaches us that he spent the night in the depths of Halacha.

**Tosfos says that the text here shouldn't read, “whenever the Shchina (represented by) the Aron Kodesh is not in their place, it's forbidden to have relations” since it's not applicable here. Rather, this line is written in Eiruvim where it says that Yehoshua was punished because he stopped the Jews from having children (by stopping them from having relations). We can say the reason he was punished not to have any male children is because of Mida Keneged Mida that he stopped Jews from having children (that night), however, the other punishments he got was because he stopped the Torah learning.**

R' Shmuel b. Unya comments: from here we see that learning Torah is greater than bringing the Tamid, as it says “I come for now.” (So, how can we say earlier that Korbanos are greater than Torah?)

The Gemara answers: it's not difficult, (it's greater) than the learning of an individual (and is lesser) than the learning of a group.

The Gemara asks: is it true that the learning of an individual is lesser? After all, we learned in a Mishna: the Tana Kamma says; (by funerals) men “cry out” during Chol Hamoed, but they don't bang. R' Yishmael says that they can bang if they're close to the coffin. However, on Rosh Chodesh, Chanuka or Purim, they may cry out and bang, but not lament.

**Tosfos explains: “crying out” means together. “Lamenting” means that one person laments and the others respond by repeating it. “Banging” refers to clapping hands, or clapping your hand on your thigh or on your face.**

Rabba b. Huna says: there is no Chol Hamoed (restrictions to mourn) in front (of the body of) a Talmid Chachum, and of course, there are no Chanuka and Purim (restrictions).

**Tosfos adds: the day that they hear about his death, (even if it's a long time after his death), is considered as if they're in front of (the Talmid Chachum's body).**

(So, we see that an individual Torah learning is greater than Purim, which is greater than Korbanos.)

**Tosfos explains the proof: since it's permitted to eulogize (the Talmid Chachum) on Purim, although it may prevent them from reading the Megila, (we can deduce that) Torah learning is greater than reading the Megila.**

The Gemara answers: the honor of the Torah of an individual is greater, but the actual learning is lesser.

### **New Sugya**

Rava says: it's simple to me that, if someone has a choice between the Avoda and reading the Megila, Megila comes first like R' Yossi b. Chanina (that you push off the Avoda to hear Megila.) A choice between learning Torah and reading the Megila, the Megila comes first like they relied in the house of Rebbi (to stop learning to hear the Megila). A choice between learning Torah and to bury a Meis Mitzva (someone who doesn't have anyone to bury) we say a Meis Mitzvah is greater since you stop learning to take out a dead person (to bury) and to bring in a Kallah (to Chupa).

**Tosfos explains: we're not exact by calling this Meis Mitzva, since the same applies to all dead people that we cancel Torah study to take them out (for burial). (The reason why it says it's a Meis Mitzva); since we'll bring soon about (the contrast between burying) a real Meis Mitzvah and a sister, so we also contrast here Torah learning and Meis Mitzva.**

Between the Avoda and Meis Mitzva, Meis Mitzva is greater from the Drasha on the word "his sister." As we learn: why does the Pasuk say by a Kohain Gadol that he can't become Tamai to his sister (since it already said that he's forbidden to all relatives)? It must be to teach us: if Someone's going to Shecht his Pesach or to give a Mila to his son, and he heard that a relative died, I might say that he should become Tamai to him (which will push off these Mitzvos), so the Torah says not to become Tamai. I might say that the same way that you shouldn't become Tamai to a sister, you shouldn't become Tamai to a Meis Mitzva, so the Torah says "to your sister." Only to your sister you don't become Tamai, but you can become Tamai to a Meis Mitzva.

**R' Elchonon asks: why do we need a Pasuk to teach us this? (After all, we should know it anyhow) from a Kal V'chomer from Torah learning. We see that Torah study, which is stringent, gets pushed off because of the honor of the dead, Avodah, which is more lenient, of course gets pushed off. (Don't say this is not true since Avodah is greater than individuals learning Torah), because even communal Torah study gets pushed off for this like it says in Kesuvos.**

**Tosfos answers: that's only so (that you cancel Torah learning) for the death of someone who learned Tanach and Mishnayos. For him, you need many people to escort him. However, if he didn't learn, he doesn't need that many people to escort him (so we don't cancel the Yeshiva for his funeral). Therefore, we refer here to a Meis Mitzva who wasn't learned, so, for him, we need the Pasuk of 'sister' (to teach us that you cancel the Avodah for him).**

Rava inquires: between reading the Megila and a Meis Mitzva, which is greater? Is reading the Megila greater since it publicizes the miracle or is a Meis Mitzva greater since it involves human dignity? After he inquired, he solved it: Meis Mitzva is greater, since it even pushes off a Lav from the Torah.

### **New Sugya**

We already learned: R' Yehoshua b. Levi Darshens that anyplace that's near, or seen with, a walled city gets the status as if they live in the walled city. The Gemara asks: I understand the case of being seen with, and not being close, like if it's situated on a high mountain. However, how can it be close and not seen? R' Yirmiya answers: you find it in a case where it's situated in a valley.

R' Yehoshua b. Levi says: a walled city that was first settled before it was encircled with a wall has the status of a village. As the Pasuk says “when someone sells a house in a city settled in a wall.” This infers that it needs to have the wall first and settled afterwards, and not first settled and then make the wall afterwards.

**Tosfos quotes Rashi that this was said regarding (selling) a house in a walled city. This makes sense since the Gemara brings a Pasuk of “when you sell etc. (which refers to selling a house in the walled city).**

**Tosfos asks: if this is true, then the Gemara should have brought this statement in Erichin where it refers to all other Halachos of (selling) houses in a walled city. Another question: (it shouldn't say that it has the status of a village), but as an open space city, which is the terminology used by selling houses.**

**Therefore, Tosfos concludes: it refers to reading the Megila. Still, it's applicable to bring the Pasuk “when you sell” to teach us that the wall of our Mishna is just like the type that makes a walled city (regarding selling), i.e., that the wall was made first and then it was settled. As the Pasuk says: “when someone sells a house in a city settled in a wall.” This infers that it needs to have the wall first and settled afterwards and not settled and the wall made afterwards.**

**Tosfos asks: later, we'll say that the sea at Teveria is like a wall, although it's not a true wall and it doesn't have a status of a wall city regarding selling a house, still, Teveria would read on the fifteenth since the (sea) protects them from (invading) enemies. If that's true, then we should say the same here when it was settled and then encircled with a wall, (although it's different than a walled city regarding selling), that it still encloses and protects from enemies, (so, it should have the status of a walled city regarding reading the Megila).**

**Tosfos answers: Teveria is different. Since the sea surrounding it works like a wall, (which is the variable needed) regarding the Megila, you should be able to read the Megila on the fifteenth, since this protection came before the settlement. Therefore, it's comparable to other encirclements that get the status of walled cities (regarding selling a house). However, if the city is settled and then walled, then, we never find that it should get the status of a walled city in any aspect.**

**Tosfos asks:** later, we learn from the Pasuk “that it has a wall” to exclude a “Shor Agor,” which means that they “gathered a wall,” like when they have attached houses surrounding the city which may function like a wall around the city. However, why do we need a Pasuk to exclude it? After all, it's anyhow not considered a walled city since it was settled before it was surrounded, since it wasn't surrounded until after all the houses were built.

**Tosfos answers:** we need the Pasuk in the case where we are sure that none of the houses were lived in until they finished building all the houses, still, it's not considered as a walled city.

**Also,** when we say that it has the status of a village, we must say that there aren't ten non-workers. After all, if it had ten non-workers, why would it be worse than large cities who always read on the fourteenth (and never reads earlier like the villagers).

R' Yehoshua b. Levi also said: a metropolis that doesn't have ten people who don't do work, (and are ready to be the ten people to Daven for a Minyan), only has a status of a village.

**Tosfos explains:** we must be referring to regular metropolises brought in the Gemara, but not those that are walled from Yehoshua b. Nun. Those read on the fifteenth even if they don't have ten non-workers.

This is obvious from the Gemara that will ask soon: what's his Chiddush? After all, we already learned it. The Gemara answers: it's needed in the case of a metropolis, although they might get more non-workers visiting from other places. Now, if it would be true that you need ten non-workers in a walled city that had a wall since Yehoshua b. Nun, it should have answered that we need his statement for these walled cities despite being walled and being protected from the enemy plus they have visiting non-workers, and that would be even a bigger Chiddush than what the Gemara answered. Rather, (from the fact the Gemara doesn't answer this), it's a proof that those that were walled since Yehoshua b. Nun doesn't need to have ten (non-workers to read on the fifteenth).

The Gemara asks: what's his Chiddush? After all we already learned it: what is a big city? If it has ten people who don't do work. Less than that is a village. The Gemara answers the Chiddush is being a metropolis. Although people come from all over (and many tourist don't work, still, since the non-workers are not settled there, it has the status of a village).

R' Yehoshua b. Levi says: a metropolis that was destroyed and resettled still has a status of a metropolis. The Gemara asks: regarding what aspect was this said? If it was saying that the wall was destroyed (and it doesn't have the status of a walled city), since it only has the status when the walls are up. That can't be since we learned: R' Eliezer b. Yossi says; the Pasuk says “that it has (lo) a wall.” (Lo is written with a Aleph to give it a connotation that it doesn't have a wall, and is read with a Vuv that connotes that there is a wall. To reconcile the two ways the Pasuk is read) that it applies even if it doesn't have a wall now, but had one previously.

**Tosfos asks:** why should we ask from R' Eliezer (b. Yossi) when we could prove the opposite from the Rabanan who argue with him? (After all, they hold that, once the wall fell), the



original Kedusha (of being a walled city) was only for that time, but not for the future (after the wall is no longer there).

Tosfos answers: we must say that R' Yehoshua (b. Levi) doesn't hold like the Rabanan. After all, if he would hold like them, then what would it help if it was resettled, since he holds that, once the original Kedusha left, it won't receive another Kedusha.

Rather, what does it mean that it was destroyed? It means it was desolate from the ten non-workers.

Tosfos explains: we must refer to a case where it wasn't walled from the days of Yehoshua b. Nun, as we explained earlier, they don't need ten non-workers (to read on the fifteenth).

Tosfos asks: what difference does it make that it was originally a large city? After all, it should be like any village (that grew) and settled ten non-workers. (Therefore, the fact that it originally had ten non-workers is superfluous.)

Tosfos answers: it's a Chiddush. Not only if it was originally just a village and it grew into a large city does it have the status of a large city since there is no reason to believe that the population will decline. However, even in this city where the population declined once, I might say that it might decline again and we won't give it the full status of a large city. So the Chiddush is that we're still not concerned about this.

*[The Rash from Desau (in back of the Gemara) asks: since villagers may read on the fourteenth, why do you need to be concerned that the population may decline? After all, even if it declines, he may read it on the fourteenth.*

*He answers: perhaps if he read it on the earlier day, when he reads it again on the fourteenth he shouldn't make a Bracha. After all, if it ever declines, he would be Yoitza with the first reading and wouldn't need to read it on the fourteenth, and the Bracha then would be L'vatala.]*