

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Megila Daf 9
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
learntosfos.com
Subscribe free: tosfosproject@gmail.com

New Sugya

There is no difference Sefarim (Sefer Torah, Navi etc.), and Tefilin and Mezuzos but that the Sefarim can be written in any language and Tefilin and Mezuzos need to be written (in Lashon Hakodesh) in Ashuros letters. R' Shimon b. Gamliel says that, even Sefarim, they didn't allow writing it (in any other foreign language) besides Greek. The Gemara infers: they're the same regarding needing to sew them with sinew and that they make hands Tamai.

The Gemara asks a contradiction to our Mishna: a Braisa says; if the Hebrew part of the Sefer was written in Aramaic, or the Aramaic part was written in Hebrew, or if it was written with the Ivri alphabet, the Sefer (is not Kosher enough) to make your hands Tamai until you write it in the Ashuros alphabet and with ink. (So, we see you can't write a Sefer in another language.)

Tosfos points out: later the Gemara will establish this Braisa to refer to a Megila.

Tosfos asks: we say in the second Perek that if a Gifti speaking person reads the Megila in Giftis, or an Ilmi speaking person reads it in Ilmis, they're Yoitza. It must refer to when it was written in the language you're read it in, for, if it wasn't, then the person is reading it by heart (since he's not reading the words written in the Megila). If so, why doesn't it make hands Tamai? After all, it's a Sefer that you're allowed to write and read from, (which should give it the status of a true Sefer), as long as you understand the language.

Tosfos answers: since it's not Kosher to read but to those who understand the language, that's why it doesn't make hands Tamai. However, when it's written in Ashuros, it's Kosher to everybody, even those who don't understand (Hebrew). (Since it's universally Kosher), that's why it makes hands Tamai.

Daf 9a

Rava answers: it's not difficult; there, (where we permit it in another language), refers to writing it in our Aleph Beis letters, the other one, (where we say you can't), refers to writing it in their alphabet letters.

Abaya asks: how can we establish that Braisa as referring to using a different alphabet? After all, why then does the Braisa need to come on to a case of Hebrew that was written in Aramaic, or vice versa? Even if the Hebrew and Aramaic was written in the proper language it's Pasul (because it's written in the wrong alphabet letters). As we conclude: (it's Pasul) until it's written in Ashuros on a Sefer (i.e., Klaf) with ink.

Rather, Abaya reconciles the two: (it's Kosher) according to the Rabanan and (it's Pasul) according to R' Shimon b. Gamliel. The Gemara asks: if it's R' Shimon b. Gamliel, (how can you claim it's always Pasul in a different language?) After all, he allows it if it's written in Greek.

Rather, the Gemara reconciles: (it's Kosher) by Sefarim and (it's Pasul) by Tefilin and Mezuzos. What's the reason it's Pasul by Tefilin and Mezuzos? Since it says "these (words)" i.e., in the way they are, (i.e., in Hebrew). The Gemara asks: (how can we say that it refers to Tefilin and Mezuzos?) After all, what Aramaic is written in them (to say that if you switched those words to Hebrew, it's Pasul)? I understand that the Torah has the words "Yigar Sidusa" (what Lavan called the mound that bears witness to their treaty).

Tosfos asks: why does this invalidate the Sefer Torah (by switching the language of those words)? After all, even if the three words are completely missing, the Sefer Torah is still Kosher. As the Gemara in Gitten says: you can't read from a Sefer Torah that's missing a page. This implies that only if it's missing a page, but not a few words.

Rashi pushes an answer: it's worse if it's written in Aramaic (when it should be written in Hebrew) than if it was completely missing those words.

Tosfos answers: (we're not saying that it's Pasul and you can't read from it), but rather, it's considered as having a mistake in it, and, therefore, you're obligated to correct it.

However, here (by Tefilin and Mezuzos), what Aramaic is there?

Rather, the Gemara reconciles: (it's Pasul) by a Megila (and is Kosher) by other Sefarim. Why is it Pasul by Megila? Since it says "like their writing and their language" (i.e., the ones that they were originally written in). The Gemara asks: what Aramaic is written in them (to say that if you switched those words to Hebrew, it's Pasul)? R' Pappa says "they heard the Pisgam (i.e., proclamation of a decree) of the king." R' Nachman b. Yitzchok says "all women must give Yakar (i.e., honor) to their husbands."

Tosfos asks: who will we establish this Braisa like? After all, it couldn't be like the Rabanan or like R' Shimon b. Gamliel. If it would be like the Rabanan, they should have listed Megila in the Mishna along with Tefilin and Mezuzos as items that can only be written in Ashuros. It can't be like R' Shimon b. Gamliel either, since he permits writing (the Megila) in Greek. You can't just say that he only allows Greek by other Sefarim, but he admits that you can only have Ashuros by Megila. This is because: the Gemara in the second Perek says; Rava and Shmuel held that everyone is allowed a Greek Megila. The Gemara established their words to be like R' Shimon b. Gamliel, and the Chidush is that he allows Greek even by the Megila.

Tosfos answers: (really, it's like R' Shimon b. Gamliel and he holds you can't use a Greek Megila). We're forced to say that the one who answered this in our Gemara didn't hold of Rav and Shmuel's words later on, and holds that R' Shimon b. Gamliel didn't permit a Megila (in any other language but Ashuros). This is because the Pasuk says "like their writing and their language" (i.e., the ones that they were originally written in). However, Rav and Shmuel (will disagree, and, therefore, can't reconcile the Braisa and Mishna in this way) and agree to R' Ashi's answer that's coming up (to reconcile the Braisa and Mishna).

R' Ashi reconciles them as follows: when we learned (they're Pasul) it refers to other Sefarim (besides a Sefer Torah). The author is R' Yehuda. As a Braisa says: you can only write Tefilin and Mezuzos in Ashuros letters, but our teachers allow it in Greek. The Gemara asks: how can they allow it if the Pasuk says "these (words)" i.e., in the way they are, (i.e., in Hebrew). Rather, we must say the real text is that you can write Sefarim in all languages, but our teachers allow it in Greek. The Gemara asks: this would imply

that the first Tanna disallows (Greek, which is not true, since he allows it in all languages). Rather, the real text is that you can write Sefarim in all languages, but our teachers only allow it in Greek.

Anyhow, we have another Braisa that says: R' Yehuda says that our teachers only allowed Greek by a Sefer Torah, which is because of the story with King Talmi.

Tosfos asks: R' Ashi in Mesechta Shabbos says; there is no difference between Sefarim and Megila but that the Sefarim can be written in all languages and Megila needs to be written in Ashuros, on Klaf and with ink. This proves that he holds that other Sefarim don't need to be written in Ashuros, on Klaf and with ink. If so, why does R' Ashi say here that R' Yehuda needs all Sefarim to need all this (i.e., to be written in Ashuros, on Klaf and with ink)? After all, we don't find anyone that argues (with that Gemara in Shabbos, and we only see that R' Yehuda needs it to be written in Hebrew, but not any of those other conditions).

Tosfos answers: the Gemara in Shabbos (is not saying what makes it Kosher), but which ones you may save (on Shabbos) from a burning house. So, you may save other Sefarim even if they're written in other languages (and are invalid) since they have many holy names of Hashem written in them. However, Megila doesn't have Hashem's name written in it, therefore, you can't save it unless it's written in a way that it's Kosher. Our Gemara discusses how the Sefarim are Kosher to read from them.

As we learned: there was a story with King Talmi who gathered seventy two rabbis and brought them into seventy two different houses, and didn't tell them why they were there. They went to each one and ordered them to “translate the Torah of your teacher, Moshe.” Hashem put into each one's heart advice (of how to translate difficult-to-explain passages, which regularly need some Drasha, but Talmi wouldn't accept those explanations); and they all had the same idea (of what to change).

They wrote “Elokim created Breishes” (instead of how it's written “Breishes created (by) Hashem”).

Tosfos quotes Rashi: if it would be written “Breishes created” they would say that Breishes is a name, and thus, there are two gods (Chas V'shalom).

Tosfos asks: Breishes is not a name, but it means “in the beginning.” Also, that's what they would have written in Greek.

Therefore, Tosfos explains: the Greeks think that the Pasuk should write the name of the Creator first. Therefore, if it would say “Breishes” first (it would show that it's a Creator) and there are two gods (Chas V'shalom), and the first word would be the name of one of the Creators, and Elokim would be the name of the second Creator. That's why they switched them around.

“I will make man in the image etc.” (instead of “let us make man,” which infers that there are many powers up high). “He finished work on the sixth and He rested on the seventh” (instead of “He finished on the seventh day,” which sounds like He worked on Shabbos). “He created him, male and female” (instead of “created them” to show that Adam was created first by himself). “I shall go down and mix up their language,” (instead of “we will go etc.”) “Sora laughed with her relatives” (i.e., publicly, instead of “she laughed inside her” so not to ask why was she different than Avraham who also laughed inside and didn't get reprimanded). “With your anger you killed an ox, and with your will, you uprooted the manger”

(instead of saying they killed a man, which would seem that Yaakov considered them murderers). “Moshe took his wife and sons and rode them on an (animal) that carries people,” (which infers a camel, instead of “on a donkey” so that Talmi shouldn't ask: didn't he have anything more dignify to ride, like a horse or camel).

Tosfos explains: perhaps they would ask; did your master Moshe not have a horse or camel to ride on?

“The settlements of the Jews in Egypt and other lands were four hundred years.” “They sent the 'Zatutai' Jews.” (The term Zatutai infers great people, which was instead of the true text 'young' Jews, since it was degrading that they had these youths in such prominence). “He didn't send his hand (to punish) the Zatutai Jews.” (which is a change from the word Atzilei, which also means great people, but they changed it to Zatutai since they used that word earlier in that Parsha).

Tosfos asks: why didn't the Chachumim use the word Atzilei in the first Pasuk to describe them as great people just like it's written in the second Pasuk? (So, why did they need to change it to a different expression of “Zatutai?”)

Tosfos answers: they didn't want to lie outright. That's why they used the term “Zatutai” for both the youths and the great people (since it has a double meaning). After all, we see that it has the connotation of greatness from the sea's Zuto (tidal wave) as brought in the second Perek of Bava Metzia. It also has the connotation of lowly, as it says in Medrish: the Pasuk says “who said to the depths 'my sword.'” This refers to Bavel that's in the 'Zuto' of the world, i.e., the depths and lowly, since it's the lowest land. As the Gemara says: it's called Bavel since all the dead from the great flood 'Mabul' was shaken out (i.e., deposited) there (since the water washed them to the lowest level).

Daf 9b

“I didn't take anything of value,” (instead of “I didn't take any donkey,” that may be taken to mean that he took other items). “(The heavenly bodies) which I gave to you to shine on all nations,” (instead of leaving out the shining clause, so it shouldn't sound that Hashem gave it over for them to worship, and non-Jews may worship them. However, the Drasha is that they were given to them to worship in order that they should be banned from the next-world.) “They will go and worship other gods that I didn't command to worship them,” (instead of “I didn't command, period,” so it couldn't be misconstrued to mean that He didn't command for them to be created, but they exist by themselves). “(You shouldn't eat) the short-legged creature” and not 'rabbit' since that was Talmi's wife's name and he might say that the Jews are mocking him by putting his wife's name in the Torah.

New Sugya

R' Yochanan says: the Halacha is like R' Shimon b. Gamliel (that you may only write it in Greek). R' Yochanan says: what's the reason for R' Shimon b. Gamliel? Since the Pasuk says “Hashem will make beautiful Yefes, and he'll dwell in the tents of Sheim.” (So, Hashem will make a language of Yefes to go with the Torah, learned in Sheim's tents.) The Gemara asks: perhaps (it's a different language of the children of Yefes) like Gomer or Magog? R' Chiya b Abba says: the reason is because it says “Hashem will make beautiful Yefes,” i.e., only the most elegant language of Yefes will be in the tents of Sheim.

New Sugya

There is no difference between a Kohain Gadol who got anointed with the holy oil and a Kohain Gadol (that wasn't anointed, but just became so) through wearing the extra clothes (of the Kohain Gadol) except for bringing a bull as an atonement on all the Mitzvos (that a layman brings a regular Chatos. It's only applicable if he was actually anointed with the oil.)

Tosfos explains: this refers to the Kohain Gadol who sinned and transgressed a Mitzva that he shouldn't have done, and sinned with something that's punishment is Kareis if done purposely.

However, you can't explain that it refers to when (Beis Din makes a mistake, and through their wrong P'sak, a majority of Jews sinned) that they bring a "bull of the forgetting," which the Pasuk says that the anointed Kohain Gadol is the one who does its Avoda. After all, in Toras Kohanim, we have a Drasha to include a regular Kohain, that he may also do its Avoda. If so, of course, an unanointed Kohain Gadol that put on the extra clothes may do its Avoda.

There is no difference between a Kohain Gadol that's presently providing over the services and one (that was appointed as a substitute when the Kohain Gadol wasn't fit for the Avoda) and was removed from the position (when the original Kohain Gadol returned); except for bringing the (Kohain Gadol's) bull on Yom Kippur and bringing the daily (Mincha that consists of a) tenth of an Eipha.(flour).

Tosfos asks: why do we need to say this about a Kohain Gadol that was removed? After all, even when the regular Kohain Gadol is unfit (on Yom Kippur) and he's doing the Avoda in his stead, you still have this difference. As the regular Kohain Gadol pays for the bull, even if he's not performing the Avoda, as the Yerushalmi says. So, the Mishna should have said "the difference between a regular Kohain Gadol and the Kohain Gadol who will be eventually removed."

Tosfos answers: if it would have said "the Kohain Gadol who will be eventually removed," then I would have thought that, if he was already removed, there are plenty more differences between them. Therefore, it lists "a Kohain Gadol that was removed" to teach us that, even after he's removed, there is no other differences but this one.

Tosfos asks: according to what we explained, that the regular Kohain Gadol pays for the bull even if he's currently not fit to do the Avoda; the following Gemara in Shvuos is difficult. As the Gemara Darshens "(the bull) that's his" and it's not from his Kohanim brothers (i.e., the rest of the Kohanim." However, according to what we said, the Gemara should have made a better implication from the Pasuk "and not even from the Kohain who's actually doing the Avoda instead of him," (which would be a greater reason why I might have thought that the understudy Kohain Gadol should pay for it than regular Kohanim.)

Tosfos answers: perhaps, since it's not a common occurrence (that the Kohain Gadol needs to be replaced for Yom Kippur), the Gemara skipped that case and used a much more common case that's applicable every year.

Also Tosfos is bothered by this question: the Gemara in Menachos says that (this bull) needs to be Shechted by its owner. If it's true that, in the case where the Kohain Gadol is replaced he still pays for the bull, then the owner is not Shechting it.

Tosfos answers: since the Torah gives it over to the replacement, it's as if he (owned it) and made it Kodesh.

The Gemara infers from the Mishna: (the anointed and the unanointed Kohain Gadol) are the same regarding bringing the Yom Kippur bull and the tenth of an Eipha Mincha. The Gemara comments: our Mishna is not like R' Meir, as we learned: the (unanointed Kohain Gadol) that just wore the extra clothes brought the bull (Chatos) when he transgressed all Mitzvos, and the Chachumim say that he doesn't bring it. What is R' Meir's reason? As we learned: the Pasuk says 'anointed.' From this I would say that he only brings it if he was anointed. How do we know that he brings it even if he was unanointed and became a Kohain Gadol by wearing the extra clothes? The Pasuk adds "the anointed," (the extra 'the' tells us to include the unanointed one too).

The Gemara asks: how can we establish our Mishna not like R' Meir? After all, in the end clause of the Mishna it says that there is no difference between a Kohain Gadol presently serving, and one that was removed but the Yom Kippur bull and the tenth of an Eipha Mincha. However, in all other regards they're the same. This is R' Meir's opinion. As we learned: R' Meir says: if a Kohain Gadol becomes Pasul and they appointed someone in his stead, when the first one returns, the second one retains all the Mitzvos of a Kohain Gadol (i.e., serves like a Kohain Gadol). R' Yossi says: the first one returns to his Avoda as usual, the second one can't serve, not like the Kohain Gadol or like a regular Kohain. So happened to R' Yossi b. Ulam of Tzipori; that the Kohain Gadol became Pasul, he was appointed Kohain Gadol in his stead. When the story came to the Chachumim, they Paskined: the first one returns to his Avoda as usual, the second one can't serve, not like the Kohain Gadol or like a regular Kohain. He can't serve like a Kohain Gadol since there will be animosity from the first Kohain Gadol (since he looks like he's taking over). He can't serve like a regular Kohain since we only make people ascend in holiness, and not to be placed down.

Tosfos asks: why do we need this reason? You should say the reason (he can't serve with the four clothes like a regular Kohain) since, in truth, he's fit to be a Kohain Gadol, and he would serve like one if it wasn't for the animosity. Therefore, he can't serve in only four clothes since, to him, it would be serving missing many articles of clothing, (which invalidates the Avoda).

Tosfos answers: we wouldn't have cared if it was only for this problem. After all, since (his status) is all dependent on Beis Din. (Therefore, they have the power to demote him to a regular Kohain and he could serve with only four articles of clothing), if it wasn't for that we make him ascend in holiness (and not demote him).

The Gemara finishes its question: it seems that the author of the first part of the Mishna is like the Chachumim and the author of the last part is like R' Meir.

R' Chisda answers: yes, (this is the way we must say that the Mishna was compiled), the author of the first part of the Mishna is like the Chachumim and the author of the last part is like R' Meir.

R' Yosef answers: the author of the Mishna is Rabbi, and he personally held like different Tannaim. (In the first case he held like the Chachumim and in the last case he held like R' Meir.)

New Sugya

There is no difference between the large (public) Bamah (that they used for Korbanos when they didn't have a functioning Mishkon or Beis Hamikdash), and a small (private) Bamah, but bringing the Korban Pesach. (You may only bring it on the large Bamah.) This is the rule: you can bring anything that you can voluntarily swear to bring, or gift (without swearing), on a (small private) Bamah; but not Korbanos that you can't voluntarily swear to bring or you can't gift.

The Gemara asks: is it true that the Korban Pesach is the only Korban brought on the public Bama and not the private one? (After all, you can't bring the Tamid an Musaf on the small ones (since they're not brought voluntarily, and they must have been brought on the big Bamah.)

The Gemara answers: we mean anything similar to Pesachim (that are obligations that must be brought at a certain time). Who's the author? It's R' Shimon. As we learned: R' Shimon says that they didn't bring Korbanos on the public Bamah but Pesachs and other Korbanos that must be brought at a certain time. However, you can't bring obligated Korbanos that don't need to be brought at a certain time on neither Bamah, (i.e., public or private).

Tosfos reasons: since we establish the Mishna to be like R' Shimon, we should assume the last clause of the Mishna is like him too, that you can bring any voluntary Korbanos, (whether through an oath or gift), on a (small) Bama.

Tosfos asks: it seems that a Nazir should be classified under being voluntary through an oath (since you voluntarily make an oath to become a Nazir) as the Gemara in Temura says. Yet, R' Shimon holds in Zevachim that you can't even bring Korbanos of a Nazir (or Menachos) on the large (public) Bamah.

Tosfos answers: our Mishna means like this; any volunteer Korban that can be brought on the large (public) Bamah, like an Olah and Shlomim brought by an individual, you can also bring it on a small (private) Bamah. However, if it's not a volunteer Korban, even though you may bring it on the large Bamah, you can't bring it on the small Bamah. However, our Mishna admits that there are voluntary Korbanos that aren't brought on neither, not the large or small Bamah.