

**Daf Hashvua Gemara and Tosfos: Megila 19**  
**By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz**  
**LearnTosfos.com**

**New Sugya**

The Mishna list items that you can't use as ink. The Gemara explains: Sam is paint; Sikra, Rabbah b. b. Chana says is red ink; Kumus is gum. quotes Shmuel who explains Kankantom to be shoe polish.

**Tosfos quotes Rashi that it's called shoe polish. However, if this is true, then you wouldn't be able to add it to ink. (The very fact that we do add it to ink shows that Kankantom is not this shoe polish. Also, we see in Eiruvim that you can't put Kankantom in the ink. This is because the Pasuk says by Sotah "you write it and you erase it," that you need writing that can be erased. Therefore, it can't be the shoe polish, since we put it in our ink and we're able to erase it well.**

**Therefore, Tosfos explains: that Kankantom is vitriol. Although we say that it's yellow, still, it turns black when you finely chop it up.**

**Daf 19a**

Diftira is hides treated with salt and flour, but not with gallnuts (that would make it into Klaf).

**Tosfos asks: how can we write Sifrei Torah, Tefilin and Megilos on our Klafs since they're not treated with gallnuts?**

**R' Tam answers: the lime we put on the Klaf treats it just like gallnuts. After all, the Gemara in Gittin says that you can forge a document written on Klaf that's not treated with gallnuts, and you can't forge on the white side of our Klaf (i.e., the side treated with lime).**

Nayir is paper (made from grasses).

**New Sugya**

The Mishna says: you need it written in Ashuros. How do we know this? Since it says "In their writings and in its time."

The Mishna says: you need it written with ink in a Klaf. How do we know this? We learn it with a Gezeira Shava "Kesiva Kesiva" It says here "Queen Esther wrote" and it says in Yirmiya "Baruch said it by heart, and read all these words; and I wrote it on a Sefer with ink."

**R' Tam explains: our ink has the status of the Gemara's ink; but the ink made from gallnuts juice doesn't have that status. As the Gemara in Gitten says: we learned; you can write a Get with anything, with ink, Sam (paint) and anything that its marking remains; which comes to include that, which R' Chiya taught, if you write it with rain water and gallnut; it's Kosher. Anyhow, since it needed to include gallnuts after the Mishna says explicitly ink, the true ink is not from gallnuts. Therefore, he wanted to Pasul a Sefer Torah written with ink made with gallnuts. However, the German rabbis answered him: that refers to water that soaked gallnuts, however, those that are made with actual gallnuts is good ink.**

**However, Tosfos concludes: our ink is the main type of ink (nad not the one made from gallnuts). After all, the Gemara in Nida says that R' Ami checked out the color black, (to see what shade of black blood makes one a Nida), by breaking open a piece of an ink cube; and it's only applicable to break open our inks, but not galnuts (that are never in solid form).**

### **New Sugya**

The Mishna says: if someone who lives in an open city went to a walled city, or vice versa, if he'll eventually return to his home place, he reads like his home place. if not, he reads it with the city he's in.

How much of the Megila does he need to read to be Yoitza? R' Meir says: he needs to read all of it, R' Yehuda says: from "Ish Yehudi." R' Yossi says: from "Achar Hadvarim Ha'eila."

The Gemara: Rava says; we only say that he reads like his own place if he will return during the night of the fourteenth, but if he would stay there until daybreak, he reads it with the place he's presently in. Rava says: how do I know this? Since the Pasuk says "on all the open city Jews in the open city." Once it says "on all the open city Jews," why does it need to say "in the open city." It teaches us that a person who lives in an open city for a day is considered "someone from an open city." We find this regarding someone in an open city; how do we know it applies even to a walled city? The Gemara answers: it's logical to say; just like someone that's in an open city one day is called "someone from an open city," someone that's in a walled city one day is called "someone from a walled city."

Rava says: if a villager visits a city, in either case (whether he's planning to leave before or after daybreak), he reads with the city. Why is this? Since he really has the same status as the city, but the rabbis were lenient by them because they supply food and water to their brothers in the big city. However, when where they lenient? When they're in their home. But if he's anyhow in the city, he has the status of the people in the city regarding reading.

**Tosfos quotes Rashi: he needs to read the Megila even if he already read it earlier on Monday or Thursday. Tosfos asks: why does he need to read it twice? However,**

**Tosfos concedes to Rashi: since he's in the city on the night of the fourteenth, he becomes like a dweller of the city, despite that he wants to return before daybreak, and despite that he already read it earlier. This is because; since the only reason they allowed them to read earlier is because they provide food for their brethren in the city. Therefore, they're exempt from reading that day. However, that's only if they're not there on the night of the fourteenth (but they come in on the day of the fourteenth, so we're not bothering them to come in the night before). However, if they're anyhow there on the night of the fourteenth, of course they have the status of someone in the city even if he already read.**

Abaya asked him: a Braisa says; if a walled city person who went to the open city, in all cases, he reads like his home place. The Braisa is obviously has a mistake since, in this case, it should be dependant if he's going to return to his place. So, we must say that it's really referring to a villager who came to a city. Rava answers: we already established that the Braisa needs editing, so we'll edit it to say "in all cases, he reads with the people of the place that he's in."

### **New Sugya**

The Mishna brings a three way argument from where do you start reading from. We learned in a Braisa; R' Shimon b. Yochai says that you start from "Balayla Hahu." R' Yochanan says: they all learn it from the same Pasuk "Queen Esther and Mordichai the Jew wrote all power." The ones who say to read the whole Megila holds it refers to the power of Achashveirosh. The one who says from "Ish Yehudi" holds it refers to the power of Mordichai. The one who says from "Achar Hadvarim Ha'eila" holds it refers to the power of Haman. The one who held from "Balayla Hahu" holds it refers to the power of the miracle.

R' Huna says it's learned from this Pasuk "what did he see thus, and what happened to them." The ones who say to read the whole Megila holds it saying; what did Achashveirosh see to use the Beis Hamikdosh's vessels, because he calculated the seventy years, and they weren't redeemed. What happen to them; Vashti was killed. The one who says from "Ish Yehudi" holds what did Mordichai see to make Haman jealous. Because he made himself into an idol. What became of them; a miracle happened. The one who says from "Achar Hadvarim Ha'eila" holds what did Haman see to be jealous of the Jews. Because Mordichai didn't bow down. What became of them; he, and his sons, got hung. The one who held from "Balayla Hahu" holds what did Achashveirosh see to call for his book of remembrance? On thus, that Esther invited Haman (to the party). What happened with them? a miracle happened.

R' Chelbo quotes R' Chama b. Gurya quoting Rav says: that the Halacha is like the one who says you must read the whole Megila. Also, even according to the one who holds that you may read it from "Ish Yehudi," he needs the Megila to be completely written before him.

R' Chelbo quotes R' Chama b. Gurya quoting Rav: the Megila is called a Sefer and it's also called a letter. It's called a Sefer that, if it's sewn with linen threads, it's Pasul. It's called a letter, that it's Kosher even if it only had three stitches. R' Nachman says: as long as it's spread out a third.

**Tosfos explains; it seems that Rashi's explanation is correct; it should be equidistant from the beginning of the page to the first sinew stitch, and between each stitch; both from the top and bottom of the page. This is the implication from the Gemara in Makos that the three sanctuary cities should be spread out a third; from the southern border to Chevron is the same as from Chevron to Shchem, and from Shchem to Kodesh, and from Kodesh until the northern border. This is not like those who explain: that there was one stitch on the bottom, in the middle, and on top.**

### **New Sugya**

R' Yehuda quotes Shmuel: if someone reads a Megila that's written among other Kesuvim (in one volume), he's not Yoitza. Rava says: we only said he's not Yoitza if (it's the same size as the others and you can't tell where's the Megila), but if the Megila is a little bigger, or smaller, than the rest, there's no problem. Levi b. Shmuel read before R' Yehuda in a Megila that's written among other Kesuvim.

### **Daf 19b**

He asks: didn't we learn that if you read a Megila that's written among other Kesuvim, you're not Yoitza? R' Chiya b. Abba quoted this from R' Yochanan. He hit him on his head (like saying, we got to qualify it) that it only applies when reading with a congregation.

R' Chiya b. Abba quoted R' Yochanan: it's a Halacha L'moshe MiSinai that you need to leave over stitches (i.e., you don't stitch up a Sefer until the very top and bottom, but leave over some that was not stitched). He hit him on his head and said that it's only (for a practical reason), so not to tear the Sefer.

**Tosfos concludes: you need to leave space by the sewing even by a Megila, or other Sefarim, since the reason is so that it doesn't tear, (so, it applies to them too).**

R' Chiya b. Abba quoted R' Yochanan: if the cave where Moshe and Eliyahu stood (when they saw Hashem's presence) had the slightest crack in it, even with the size made by a needle; they wouldn't be able to stand because of the light. As the Pasuk says "a person can't see Me and live." Also, R' Chiya b. Abba quoted R' Yochanan: the Pasuk says "besides these, like all the things that Hashem said to you at the mountain." From here we learn; Hashem showed Moshe all the Torah's implications (from the Drashos of extra words), and all the implications of the

Rabanan's words (that later generations will glean from their teachings) and all that the Rabanan are eventually going to enact, which refers to the Megila reading.

### **New Sugya**

The Mishna says: everyone is able to read the Megila (for others) except for a deaf person, an insane person, or a minor.

**Tosfos explains; usually, when Chazal uses the term of "a deaf person," it means that he can't hear or speak. However, the deaf person mentioned here means that he can speak. After all, he's reading the Megila. Therefore, he's considered as a regular sane person regarding being obligated in all Mitzvos, except for this one, since he needs to hear what he's saying, (which is impossible for him).**

R' Yehuda allows a minor to read for others.

**Tosfos asks: wat type of minor are we referring to? If he's too young and not fit to be trained, why does R' Yehuda allow him? After all, we say in Rosh Hashana that anyone who doesn't have an obligation for a Mitzva can't be Moitzie people. If he's old enough to be trained, what's the reason for the Rabanan who hold they can't be Moitzie? After all, since everyone's obligation is only rabbinical, so why can't the minor who's also rabbinically obligated be Moitzie others who are also rabbinically obligated. As we say in Brachos; a son Benches for his father despite being a minor and he's Yoitza. The Gemara explains that we refer to a case where the father ate only a Kazayis or a Kabaitza; which is the amount for a rabbinical obligation. So, the minor who has a rabbinical obligation can be Moitzie the father who only ate the rabbinical amount. If so, why don't we say the same thing by Megila. Similarly, we can ask the same from the Gemara in Sukka that a son can't be Moitzie his father reading Hallel, (and if the father doesn't know how to say Hallel himself), he must repeat after his son word per word. So, why is it different than Bentching?**

**Tosfos answers: we really refer to a minor that's old enough for training, and he still doesn't Moitzie his father. As we see, the whole obligation for Megila is only rabbinic, and minors are only obligated rabbinically in any Mitzva, (so the minor is a double level rabbinical obligation). However, an adult only has a single rabbinical obligation by Megila, since he's usually Torah obligated in other Mitzvos. Therefore, we don't say that the minor that's only obligated by two levels of rabbinical enactments could be Moitzie and adult who's obligation is through a single rabbinical enactment. However, the case by Bentching refers to a case where the minor ate to satiation. Therefore, he only has a single rabbinical enactment, so he can be Moitzie the adult that ate a rabbinical amount since he also only has a single rabbinical enactment.**

However, it's still difficult; since it says that R' Sheishes and R' Yosef (who were blind, and according to those who hold they're exempt from the Torah from the Hagada), read the Hagada for everyone Pesach night and Moitzie others, since they held that, nowadays, Matza is only a rabbinical Mitzvah. However, according to what we just explained; how can a blind person who is only obligated in a double rabbinical enactment be Moitzie those who are obligated in a single rabbinical enactment? Tosfos answers: a blind person is better than a minor, since he was already obligated completely (before he was blind), which is not the case by a minor.

The Gemara asks: who's the opinion that a deaf person can't even B'dieved read. R' Masna says it's R' Yossi. As we learned; the Tanna Kama says that if someone reads the Sh'ma (inaudibly) and doesn't hear what he's saying; he's Yoitza. R' Yossi says that he's not Yoitza. The Gemara asks: how do you know that the Mishna is like R' Yossi that you're not even Yoitza B'dieved? Perhaps it's R' Yehuda, and the deaf can't L'chatchila read, but you're Yoitza B'dieved.

**Tosfos explains: since we Paskin like R' Yehuda, we try to fit the Mishna like him.**

The Gemara answers: we can't think this, since the Mishna teaches it along with an insane person and a minor who can't even B'dieved Moitzie others. The Gemara rejects this proof. Perhaps each one was taught with their own separate Halacha.

The Gemara brings a proof that the author of the Mishna can't be R' Yehuda; since the end of the Mishna that brings R' Yehuda, who says that a minor can read for others, implies that the first part of the Mishna is not R' Yehuda. The Gemara rejects this: perhaps the Mishna is completely like R' Yehuda, and is missing some words. This is how it should read; everyone is able to read the Megila (for others) except for a deaf person, an insane person, or a minor. When is that so? By a minor that's too young to train, but if he's old enough to train, he may L'chatchila read to be Moitzie people since R' Yehuda allows a minor to read.

The Gemara asks: how can we establish R' Yehuda's opinion to say that he's only Yoitza B'dieved? After all, we learned that R' Yehuda quotes R' Shimon b. Pazi that a deaf person who can speak may L'chatchila take off Trumah, (so, he must be making a Bracha L'chatchila). Who's opinion is this? It can't be R' Yehuda, since he holds that it's only B'dieved. It can't be R' Yossi since he holds that you're not even Yoitza B'dieved. Rather, we must say, it's R' Yehuda who says that it's L'chatchila. The Gemara asks: (if it's true that R' Yehuda holds that you're Yoitza L'chatchila), who's the author of the following Braisa: you can't Bentch in your heart (i.e., say it too low to hear); but if you do, you're Yoitza. It's not like R' Yehuda or R' Yossi. After all, R' Yehuda holds that you're Yoitza L'chatchila, and R' Yossi holds that you're not Yoitza even B'dieved.

Tosfos asks: how can we compare Bentching to Sh'ma? After all, I can understand why you're not Yoitza by Megila; since he holds like the opinion that you need to hear what you say when you say Sh'ma, and the rabbis enacted the rabbinical Mitzvos to be similar to the Torah. However, Bentching is it's own Mitzvah from the Torah, and the Torah didn't write by it "to hear." So, how do we know that he needs to hear what he's saying? Tosfos answers: they knew that they extrapolated Bentching from Sh'ma.