

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Beitza Daf 16
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
Tosfos.ecwid.com
Subscribe free or Contact: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Daf 16a

R' Tachlifa says: Hashem sets the amount of money someone will get for his food (or other expenses) from one Rosh Hashana to the next. This excludes what he spends for the honor of Shabbos or Yom Tov or for his children to learn Torah. For these, if you add a lot for them, Hashem will add more to your income accordingly. If you spend less for these items, Hashem will add to your income accordingly.

Tosfos says: we learn this from the earlier Gemara. Hashem says to take a loan for the honor of Shabbos and Yom Tov, and he'll pay for it. Also, the Pasuk there mentions 'Chedvas,' joy. This is a hint to Torah, since the Pasuk says "the laws of Hashem are just, and they give the heart joy."

R' Avahu says, we learn this from the Pasuk "blow with a Shofar on the 'Keseh,' (covered) of the day of our Chag." Which Chag is the month covered on? It's Rosh Hashana.

Tosfos quotes Rashi who explains: which Chag is the moon covered? (It's Rosh Hashana, which falls on the beginning of the month.)

Tosfos asks: the Gemara says "when the month is covered" and not "when the moon is covered."

Rather, R' Tam explains: the word 'Keseh' here means appointed. As the Pasuk says "on the appointed day, go to your house." Therefore, the meaning of our Gemara; "which Chag is appointed to fall out on Rosh Chodesh?"

R' Meshulam explains our Gemara: which Chag is Rosh Chodesh covered? I.e., that you don't bring the goat as part of the Rosh Chodesh's Musaf.

R' Tam asks: we must say they brought that goat. As the Tosefta says; they brought thirty-two goats during the year. It counts twelve of them that they brought on Rosh Chodesh. We wouldn't have twelve if we don't count the one on Rosh Hashana.

R' Meshulam answers: I never meant that they didn't bring it at all. Rather, the Pasuk doesn't explicitly mention it. As the Pasuk says that you bring (these Korbanei Musaf on Rosh Hashana), besides the Olos you regularly bring on Rosh Chodesh. It doesn't mention you also bring (this goat) Chatos.

Others explain: Rosh Chodesh is covered, since you don't mention them in the Tefilla of Musaf. However, R' Tam says, since they brought them on Rosh Hashana, you need to mention them during Musaf. Therefore, R' Tam enacted to say in Musaf "besides the Olos of the Chodesh" and "you bring two goats," i.e., one for Rosh Hashana and one for Rosh Chodesh.

The Pasuk continues: “it’s a ‘Chok’ to Jews, and a judgement to the children of Yaakov.” ‘Chok’ means food, as the Pasuk says that Parroh gave ‘Chok’ (food) to his priests. Mar Zutra brought another Pasuk: you gave me bread of my ‘Chok.’

We learned: Shammai ate every day for the honor of Shabbos. When he found a good animal to eat, he designated it for Shabbos. When he found a better one, he ate the first one and saved the latter one for Shabbos. However, Hillel had a different manner, since all his actions were for the sake of heaven. (He trusted in Hashem to provide him with a good animal for Shabbos) as the Pasuk says that Hashem blesses every day. We have a similar Braisa, that Beis Shammai says to prepare from Sunday to Shabbos. Beis Hillel said “Hashem blesses every day.”

R’ Chama b. Chanina says; if you give a gift to someone, you don’t need to inform him of it, as the Pasuk says “Moshe wasn’t aware that he had ‘horns of light’ shined from him.” The Gemara asks: “(keep my Shabbos), it’s for them to know that I’m the one who made them holy.” Hashem said to Moshe “I have this gift in my treasure house called Shabbos that I would like to present to the Jews, go inform them.” Form here R’ Shimon b Gamaliel says; if you gave food to a child, you need to inform his mother.

The Gemara reconciles: you only need to inform the recipient about a gift which he may not find out about it, but you don’t need to inform the recipient if he will eventually find out about it. The Gemara asks: they will eventually find out about Shabbos, (so, why did Moshe need to inform them?) The Gemara answers: they would not find out about the great reward there is to keep it.

The Gemara asks about R’ Shimon b. Gamliel’s statement, that when you feed a child you should inform the mother: (assuming you won’t see her), how will you convey the message? The Gemara answers: you smear oil on him and fill his eye with eye medicine/makeup. (When the mother will ask him about these things, he’ll reveal that he also got food from the person too.) Nowadays, where people are immersed in witchcraft (and you don’t want to alarm the mother perhaps someone used witchcraft on her child by putting oil and eye makeup on him), you should smear some of the food on him.

R’ Shimon b. Yochai says: Hashem gave us all the Mitzvos in public, except for Shabbos that he gave in private, as the Pasuk says “it’s between Me and the children of Israel.” The Gemara asks: if He gave it privately, why would the non-Jew get punished for not keeping it? (After all, we see that Hashem will punish non-Jews for not accepting and doing the Mitzvos.) The Gemara answers: they knew about Shabbos, but not the great reward for keeping it. Alternatively, they knew about the reward, but they don’t know about the extra Nefesh one gets for Shabbos. **(Rashi- the extra ability to enjoy oneself on Shabbos, and not to be bored with it.)** As Reish Lakish says that we receive an extra Neshama for Shabbos, and it’s taken away from us on Moitzie Shabbos. As the Pasuk says ‘Vayinafesh,’ when Shabbos is over, we say “oy, we lost our (extra) Nefesh.”

New Sugya

Abaya says: you can only have a cooked dish for an Eiruv Tavshilin, but not bread. The Gemara asks: why not bread? It can’t be because it’s not made to eat bread with it. (So, it doesn’t look special for Shabbos, but just an everyday food.) After all, we see that cereal is not made to eat your bread with it, as R’ Zeira says; those foolish Babylonians (who eat the cereal with bread) eat bread with bread, and yet,

Abaya says that you can make an Eiruv with cereal. Rather, we must say that the reason you can't use bread because it's too common of a food to have, but cereal is not as common.

Another version: the reason not to use bread can't be because it's not common, because cereal is not common, and Abaya says that you can't use cereal as an Eiruv. Rather, it must be because you don't eat bread with it, and you don't eat bread with cereal either, as R' Zeira says that those foolish Babylonians (who eat the cereal with bread) eat bread with bread.

New Sugya

R' Chiya says: you can use leftover lentils on the bottom of the pot for an Eiruv (and we don't say it doesn't have any Chashivus), as long as there is a Kazayis. Similarly, R' Yitzchok b. R' Yehuda says that you make scrape the fats off knives for an Eiruv, as long as it's a Kazayis.

R' Assi quotes Rav: small salted fish (that's cooked by non-Jews) don't have the prohibition of Bishul Akum (they never enacted it on items that can be eaten raw). R' Yosef says (since it's permitted), if a non-Jews roasts them, you can use it for an Eiruv.

Tosfos (on Amud Beis) points out: it's permitted because it was salted, and therefore, edible raw. This implies, if it wasn't salted, and wasn't edible raw, if a non-Jew cooks it, it's forbidden. Tosfos asks: in Mesechtas Avoda Zara we say that all foods that aren't (Chashuv enough) to bring up on the table of kings don't have the problem of Bishul Akum, like small fish, (so even if it wasn't salted, these small fish should be permitted).

Tosfos answers: over there, the Gemara refers to tiny fish. Our Gemara refers to not so small fish, and therefore, it's sometimes brought to the king's table to eat with his bread.

However, if the non-Jew uses fish fats to make a dish mixed with flour, it's forbidden (since the flour can't be eaten raw). The Gemara asks: this seems to be simple (so why mention it?)

Daf 16b

The Gemara answers: I might think that the fish fat is the main ingredient, and since you can eat it raw, the concoction is permitted. Therefore, we teach differently, that the flour is the main ingredient.

Tosfos says: from here we find the Heter to eat a non-Jew's bread kneaded with eggs. There is no problem eating the bread, since they permitted non-Jews' bread. The eggs aren't a problem either, (although a non-Jew cooked it), since we said that the flour is the main ingredient (we don't reckon with the secondary ingredients).

We can't say that our Gemara only follows the flour being the main ingredient when it's a stringency, (like in the case of the fish fat with flour), since it's a batter that's cooked, it is classified as Bishul Akum and not as Pas Akum (and there is no Heter for Bishul Akum). However, perhaps there is no Heter by this bread, made from thick dough and baked in an oven (and is included in the Heter of non-Jews' bread), to say we follow the main ingredient when it's a leniency.

Tosfos explains why we can't say this: since our Gemara says "I might think that the fish fat was the main ingredient and it would be permitted," so we would have followed the main ingredient even to be lenient. The only reason the Gemara forbade it was because the flour was truly the main ingredient.

We don't need to worry perhaps the eggs came from a non-Kosher bird, since they're not common amongst us. We don't need to worry perhaps an egg had a bloodspot, since most don't have. Although we check the eggs from blood before putting them in a pot (so we see we're worried for bloodspots), that's only a stringency, but if you don't check them, they're permitted. We also don't need to worry perhaps it came from a Neveila or Treifa, since most eggs don't come from them.

Tosfos asks: the Gemara in Chulin says that you're not allowed to buy beaten eggs from non-Jews, so why aren't we worried they made the bread from pre-beaten eggs?

Tosfos answers: we only say not to buy actual beaten eggs from the non-Jew, since there is a red flag that they're beaten. It shows that it came from an egg of a Neveila or Treifa that a Jew sold to the non-Jew. (Since he can only sell these non-Kosher eggs to a non-Jew, but we're afraid that he'll resell them an unsuspecting Jew, they enacted to beat the eggs before you sell them, and it will be a sign for Jews not to buy them.) However, here where the eggs were already kneaded in, where there are no red flags that something's wrong, we can assume he used whole eggs.

However, if the non-Jew bakes actual fish in a dough, even the dough is forbidden, since it absorbs from the fish, which is forbidden because of Bishul Akum. So, even if the dough by itself isn't forbidden because a non-Jew baked it, and what it absorbed from the fish no longer exists by itself (and we should give it the same status as the eggs kneaded in the dough. However, this is not comparable), after all, it became forbidden when it was by itself, and then the dough absorbed some of that rabbinical prohibition (of Bishul Akum). However, there are some who just scrape off all visible fat, and eat the dough.

Tosfos originally wants to forbid a non-Jew's wafer/cake, since you don't make a Hamoitzie on it, it's not classified as Pas Akum that has a Heter, but as Bishul Akum that has no Heter. However, R' Yechiel wants to permit it since it's baked like bread, and you also make Hamoitzie on it if you base your meal on it, so it must have the status of bread.

New Sugya

R' Abba says that an Eiruv Tavshilin needs a Kazayis of food. The Gemara inquires if it needs a Kazyis for each person relying on it, or one Kazayis for everyone? The Gemara answers from Rav who said that a Kazayis suffices whether it's for one person or a hundred people.

Tosfos points out: that there are three separate Halachos about the Shiurim of different types of Eiruv. An Eiruv T'chumim needs the amount for two meal for each person, as brought in Mesechta Eiruvin. Eiruv Chatzeiros need the size of a dried fig per person participating. This is true until it amasses to the size of two meal. After that, those two meals suffice to everyone, even if there are a hundred participants. Eiruv Tavshilin, whether being relied on by one person or by a

hundred, only requires a Kazayis from each type of way to prepare food (cooked or baked).

The Gemara asks: our Mishna says if you eat the Eiruv or if it got lost, you can't finish cooking unless there remains a little bit. Doesn't this mean even less than a Kazayis? The Gemara answers: no, we refer to leaving over a Kazayis (which is a little bit in contrast to a whole loaf).

The Gemara brings a proof from the following Braisa: you can have the Eiruv from roasted, pickled, overcooked or cooked food. You can even use a certain salted fish (that doesn't require much cooking to prepare it), that you poured hot water over it. The Eiruv's "beginning and end" (i.e., what you put out originally, and what's left if part of it gets eaten) doesn't have any Shiur. Doesn't it mean that it doesn't have a minimum Shiur (and can be smaller than a Kazayis)? The Gemara answers: no, it means that there is no maximum Shiur, but there is a minimum Shiur.

R' Huna quotes Rav that you need knowledge of the Eiruv. The Gemara says that it's simple that he means the one who makes the Eiruv must intend for the food to be an Eiruv on Eruv Yom Tov. However, does he require that the ones he makes it for should also have intent for the Eiruv on Eruv Yom Tov?

The Gemara answers: no, since we see that Shmuel made an Eiruv for the whole city Nahardai and R' Ami and R' Assi made an Eiruv for the whole Teveria. R' Yaakov b. Idi called out: anyone who didn't make an Eiruv should rely on his Eiruv. The Gemara asks: how far can a person live away from the Eiruv's maker and still rely on his Eiruv? Abaya answers: within the T'chum. (However, we don't assume that the one who made the Eiruv had in mind for anyone living further.)

A blind person used to learn Mishnayos before Shmuel. One Yom Tov he saw that he was nervous. He asked why, and he answered because he forgot to make an Eiruv Tavshilin. Shmuel said: don't worry, you can rely on mine (that I made for everyone in the city). The next year, he also seemed nervous. Shmuel asked why, and he answered because he forgot to make an Eiruv Tavshilin. This time Shmuel called him someone who is negligible of keeping the rabbis' enactments. Therefore, everyone else can rely on me, (but you can't) and it's forbidden for you to cook for Shabbos. (Shmuel didn't have in mind that the Eiruv should be for people who are not particular to keep the rabbis' enactments.)

New Sugya

The Tanna Kama says, when Yom Tov falls on Eruv Shabbos, you can't make an Eiruv T'chumim or an Eiruv Chatzeiros. Rebbi says you can't make a Eiruv T'chumim, but you can make an Eiruv Chatzeiros. You can only forbid making an Eiruv for something which is forbidden to do on Yom Tov, but not for something you can do on Yom Tov. Rav says the Halacha is like the Tanna Kama and Shmuel says the Halacha is like Rebbi.

Tosfos asks: how can Rebbi hold you can make an Eiruv Chatzeiros from one day to the other? After all, he held that Yom Tov and Shabbos are the same Kedusha (that it's as if they're one long holy day. So, it's like you made the Eiruv on Shabbos for Shabbos, which definitely doesn't take effect, since it needs to be made on the day before.)

Tosfos answers: this is actually his reason; because he holds they're one Kedusha. However,

that is only for things that he can't do on both days, like going out of the T'chum. Therefore, he can't set up an Eiruv from Yom Tov to Shabbos, since it's one Kedusha (and it's like one day). However, for things you can do on Yom Tov, like carrying in your courtyard (you can't consider it as one Kedusha with Shabbos in this regard). Therefore, you can't stop him from making an Eiruv for Shabbos.

The Gemara inquires: does Shmuel Paskin like Rabbi leniently or stringently? The Gemara asks: of course leniently, (after all, Rabbi permitted to make the Eiruv). The Gemara answers: since R' Elazar sent a message to Baval; it's not like you taught that Rabbi permitted and the Rabanan forbade, but rather that Rabbi forbade and the Rabanan permitted.

The Gemara wanted to prove from this from the story that R' Tachlifa b. Avdimi Paskined like Shmuel. Rav commented that this rabbi's first P'sak was destructive. I would understand if he permitted when he shouldn't have why it's destructive. However, if he was stringent on them, why was that destructive? The Gemara answers: since it ruined the multitudes (that they couldn't make an Eiruv when they really could, and caused anybody who forgot and carried in the courtyard to sin). Therefore, it was destructive.

Daf 17a

R' Huna concludes the Halacha is like Rabbi to be stringent (and not to make the Eiruv).