

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Rosh Hashana Daf 23
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
limudtorah.onlinewebshop.net
Subscribe free or to sponsor: tosfosproject@gmail.com

We learned: you only light the fire on a month where the moon was seen (and sanctified) on the thirtieth. When do you light it? On the night of the thirty-first. The Gemara says that this implies they only did this for a short month and not for a full month. The Gemara asks: what's the reason? R' Zeira answers: because of a Rosh Chodesh after a short month that falls out on Friday.

Tosfos explains: they could have also said for a Rosh Chodesh after a long month that falls out on Shabbos would be a problem for the same reason.

When could you light the fires? Only on Moitzie Shabbos (since you can't light the fire the night after Rosh Chodesh, since it's Shabbos.)

Daf 23a

If you would say that you would do it for a full month too, they'll mistake that it's a short month, and they'll think that the only reason they didn't do it yesterday was, because it's impossible. Or, perhaps, they'll think the reason they did it tonight since it's the proper time (since it was a full month. So, there is no way to determine when Rosh Chodesh was.)

The Gemara asks: let them do it for both a short and full month. If Rosh Chodesh falls on Friday, then you wouldn't do it at all. So, since you didn't do it on Moitzie Shabbos, despite doing it for both short and full months, they'll figure out that it was a short month.

The Gemara answers: still it will lead to a mistake. They'll say that it was really a full month, and the only reason they didn't do it Moitzie Shabbos was because of a circumstance beyond their control prevented them.

Tosfos asks: even now that they don't light the fires for full months, when Rosh Chodesh falls out on Shabbos after a full month (and you don't light the fire), why wouldn't they also assume that it was a short month, and the reason they didn't light the fires was because of some circumstance beyond their control stopped them?

Tosfos answers: they'll only mistake that if they would light whether it's a short or full month. Therefore, when they didn't light at all, they'll definitely assume it's because of some circumstance beyond their control stopped them. However, now that they sometimes light and sometimes don't light, when they don't light on Moitzie Shabbos, they won't assume it's because of some circumstance beyond their control stopped them, but because of the more common cause of not lighting (because it's a full month).

The Gemara asks: (once you could only do it for one day and not the other) why not institute to make them for full months and not for short months?

The Gemara answers: since it will cause the nation to always be off from work two days.

Tosfos quotes Rashi who explains: there is no Rosh Hashana that the people of the Diaspora won't need to take off from work two days, no matter if Elul was short or full. However, when done on the short months, they'll know that Rosh Hashana was on the thirtieth day, and they'll be able to work on the next day.

However, Tosfos says: there was no reason to explain it that way, since you can explain it by all Roshei Chodesh since they were accustomed not to work on any Rosh Chodesh. As we see the Gemara in Megila says; on days where the people won't lose work (since they don't work anyhow), like on Chol Hamoed and Rosh Chodesh, they read four Aliyos in the Torah.

Tosfos concludes: people say that Hashem added Rosh Chodesh as a Yom Tov to women as a reward that they didn't give in at the golden calf incident. As Aharon told them to take the rings from their wives' ears. However, they all took off the rings from their own ears since their wives wouldn't give them theirs.

New Sugya

R' Yehuda says that there are four types of cedars (see the lists and explanations in the Gemara). This argues with Rabbah b R' Huna quoting the house of Rav who say that there are ten (see the list and explanations in the Gemara, and one of them includes the Hadas, the myrtle, and Almug, coral).

Tosfos brings the Gemara in Sukka that says that R' Yehuda's opinion is that you can only make S'chach from the four Minim of the Lulav. The Gemara there asks that we see R' Yehuda allows to make S'chach out of cedar boards that are less than four T'fachim squared. The Gemara answers: what do we mean by cedar? It means myrtles. As Rabbah b. R' Huna says that there are ten types of cedar (and a myrtle is one of them).

Tosfos asks: according to R' Yehuda who says that there are only four types of cedars and no more (and the myrtle is not one of them), how can we answer that question?

Tosfos answers: perhaps, here, they only argue regarding buying and selling (if you made a condition it would be made from a type of cedar, the question is what people call a type of cedar). However, R' Yehuda agrees that, in essence, there are ten types of cedar. The Yerushalmi says that there are twenty-four types of cedar.

New Tosfos: One of the types of Cedar is the 'Shita' tree, and the Targum for it is 'Tornisa.' Tosfos brings a Gemara in Avoda Zara that says; what is Itzroblin (that you can't sell to a non-Jew on their holidays)? It's Tornisa. Tosfos explains that it can't be the same Tornisa as here. After all, that doesn't have roots (don't grow from the ground) as the Gemara implies there. Our Tornisa is a type of cedar, so, of course, it has roots.

Also, the Mishna there implies that you can't sell Tornisa, (and if it would be a tree), then the implication would be; but other trees you can sell. However, that's not true, since a later Mishna there says that you can't sell anything that's attached to the ground. After all, the Gemara makes a similar deduction there regarding not selling a good palm, (that it can't mean the palm itself, since you can't sell anything attached to the ground).

Therefore, it seems that, the Tornisa there is a type of mineral, like sulfur. After all, the Gemara in Shabbos and Niddah bring it as something that doesn't have roots (and is exempt from

any Halacha of Shmita).

New Tosfos: one of the types of cedar is “oil wood” which was explained to be Afarsiman (usually translated as apricot). Tosfos asks: that, which the Pasuk says “they made the figures from oil wood,” and the Tagum explains it to be olive wood, we must say that there are two types of “oil wood.” (Don’t think to reconcile this, we should translate Afarsiman as olive wood), since we see that Afarsiman is not olive wood. After all, the Pasuk in Ezra says “go to the mountain and bring olive wood and oil wood.” We also find in Tamid that “olive wood is invalid to put on the fire that’s on the Mizbeiach, but oil wood is Kosher. (So, we see that there must be some other oil wood than olive wood.)

New Tosfos: one of the types of cedar is “Armonim” which was explained to be Dulvi. Rashi translates it to be chestnuts. Tosfos asks: in Sukkos, the Gemara asks; perhaps (the “woven branch” is not the Hadas) although it needs to have its leaves covering most of the branch (which describes the Hadas), perhaps it’s the Dulvi. (However, if you say the Dulvi is the chestnut tree), we see that they don’t have branches with leaves covering the branches. However, there in Sukkos, Rashi also translates it as chestnuts.

Rav says that the Pasuk “nor shall great ships pass there” refers to great ships (that remove coral). How do they remove the coral? Either it takes six thousand workers for twelve months, or twelve thousand workers for six months. They fill up the ship with sand until it rests on the bottom. They send a diver to tie the coral (to the ship) with flax rope. They removed the sand, and as it starts to float, it uproots the coral. When they sold it, they got twice its weight in silver.

There were three ports, two belong to the Armai and one of the Persians. The Armai ports raised coral and the Persian port raised pearls. The Persian one was called the royal port.

R’ Yochanan says: every Shita tree that the non-Jews uprooted from Yerushalayim, Hashem will eventually return. As the Pasuk says “I will give in the desert a Shita cedar.” The desert is none but Yerushalayim, as it says “Tzion was a desert.”

R’ Yochanan says: everyone who learns Torah and doesn’t teach it, he’s compared to a myrtle in middle of a desert. Another version: all who learn Torah and teach it in a place where there is no other Talmid Chachum is considered like a myrtle in the desert, since he’s so dear.

R’ Yochanan says: woe is to those non-Jews who don’t have any fix for their situation. As the Pasuk says “I can bring gold to take the place of copper. I can bring silver to take the place of iron. I can bring copper to take the place of wood and iron to take the place of stone.” However, what can be brought to take the place of R’ Akiva and his colleagues (who they killed and are irreplaceable). On them, the Pasuk says “Even when I forgive, I won’t forgive for their blood.”

New Sugya

The last place they waved the fire was on Beis Bilsan.

Daf 23b

What was it? Rav said it’s the city of Beirim.

Tosfos says that, from here, it implies that Beirim is part of Eretz Yisrael. This is how R' Tam also explains in Kiddushin, that those who have good Yichus in Pumbadisa married people of Beirim

The Gemara asks: (when it says “until they saw the whole Diaspora lit up like a bonfire”), what does it mean by the Diaspora? R' Yosef says that it's Pumbedeisa. The Gemara asks: what does it mean by “like a bonfire?” We learned: each one takes his torch up to his roof.

We learned: R' Shimon b. Eliezer says they lit fires also by Chiram, Kiyar, Geder and Chavrusi. Some say that these places were situated between the places listed in the Mishna. Others say that they're situated on the other side of Eretz Yisrael (to inform the Jews in the other direction). R' Yochanan says that there are eight Parsos between each of them. All together it's thirty-two Parsos.

Tosfos asks: when the Beis Hamikdash stood, Eretz Yisrael stretched further than stated here. As it says in the first Perek of Taanis that it was a fifteen-day journey from Yerushalayim to the end of Eretz Yisrael, as it says there regarding (not saying V'sain Tal U'matar L'vracha until the furthest person can reach the Euphrates. Don't say that this was in the opposite direction than we refer to here, since) this was heading towards Bavel, since the Euphrates was by Bavel. (This should be one hundred and fifty Parsa, since someone walks ten Parsa in one day) We don't differentiate between the first or second Mikdash (to say that the area was smaller in the era of the second Mikdash), as it implies in Eilu Metzious.

Tosfos answers: (although for most of Eretz Yisrael, it was only thirty-two Parsa until the border), there was a small strip that protruded from Eretz Yisrael until the Euphrates that's right outside Bavel (that was part of Eretz Yisrael).

Tosfos asks: we see that Yerushalayim was at the 'belly' of Eretz Yisrael (i.e., in the middle), which was four hundred Parsa square. Thus, it was a two hundred Parsa distance from Yerushalayim on each side. This should take twenty days, with the calculation that it takes a day to walk ten Parsa. (So, how can it take only fifteen days according to the Gemara in Taanis.)

Another question: we know the Jordan is the border of Eretz Yisrael and we also see that it was a day walk from Yerushalayim to the east.

The Gemara asks: but nowadays we see there is a lot more. Abaya answers: the roads are all blocked (so it takes longer to go around the detours). As the Pasuk says “thus, I will stop up the road with thorns.” R' Nachman b. Yitzchok taught it from here “I made crooked your paths.”

New Sugya

There was a big courtyard in Yerushalayim called “Beis Yazik.” All the witnesses entered it, and Beis Din interrogated them. They made a great feast for them so that they should have incentive to come.

Originally, they didn't move from that courtyard the whole day (since they left their T'chum, they can only walk within four Amos, or within Mechitzos).

Tosfos explains: since someone who left his T'chum only has four Amos (to walk in). However, the whole courtyard has the status of four Amos (since it's enclosed with Mechitzos). As we say that (if someone who takes you out of your T'chum), puts you in a stable or corral etc. (he

may walk the whole enclosure).

Tosfos is bothered by the following question: the Gemara in Eiruvin says regarding rams that were brought (by non-Jewish merchants) to the city of Mivrachasa, that the whole city is considered like four Amos (and the animals may be brought throughout the city) even though it doesn't mention anything about an enclosure.

Tosfos answers: we must say that the city was surrounded by Mechitzos. However, that won't be the case here in Yerushalayim after the Greeks made breaches in the walls, and made the city into a public domain, as it says in Eiruvin.

However, Tosfos continues: we do find that a city is considered as four Amos without Mechitzos (at least regarding establishing your original T'chum). As the Mishna says that we give a 'Karfuf' (an area of seventy and a third Amos) outskirts of a city (to be an extension of the city, and we don't start counting the T'chum until after the Karfuf area). Also, the Gemara says that, if you put your Eiruv within this outskirt extension of the city, you didn't do anything, (since it's considered as part of the city which we consider as four Amos, it's like you're anyhow establishing your Shabbos dwelling in the city. So, we see that we consider this outskirt as part of the city despite not being enclosed.) Now, if we would extend this to those who left their original T'chum, that we consider the whole city and outskirts as four Amos, then, we'll consider it like four Amos even without Mechitzos.

R' Gamliel the elder enacted that they can walk two thousand Amos in all directions. This not only applies to these witnesses, but also to a midwife walking out of her T'chum to deliver, or those who leave the T'chum to help save from a fire, from invading armies, from a river and from a landslide. They all have the status of the townsmen and have two thousand Amos in all directions.

Tosfos is bothered by the question: why don't we list this among those enactments that we permit them to do something at the end in order to do what we want them to do in the beginning?

Tosfos answers: it wasn't necessary, since it's mentioned explicitly in a Mishna. After all, the Gemara there asks on all the examples why they mention it if it's an explicit Mishna, and the Gemara answered why you needed to list them.

The Gemara asks: is it called "Beis Ya'azik" or "Beis Yazik?" Is it Ya'azik, which is a term for something good, as the Pasuk says "he 'Yaa'aziku' (surrounded us with walls to protect) and removed from us stones." Or is it 'Yazik' which is a term for pain, as it says "he was tied in chains."

Tosfos quotes Rashi: since they were tied up their as if they were in chains since they can't leave there the whole day. This was before R' Gamliel enacted for them to be able to walk two thousand Amos in all directions.

Tosfos asks: if so, how can the Gemara bring a proof from the great feast that was made. After all, that too was before R' Gamliel, (and they still felt bad because of their confinement that R' Gamliel needed to enact for them to leave the courtyard).

Therefore, it seems to Tosfos: was that confinement very small, or was it large, and they bring a proof that it couldn't have been that tight (since they enjoyed a feast).

Tosfos asks: *[Maharsha- assuming, in order to have a lot of room they wouldn't fit into one courtyard, that they needed to go into other courtyards]*, however, since they're confined to keep the prohibition of Shabbos (of leaving their enclosure), how did they leave to go from one courtyard to another?

Tosfos answers: since, before the Greeks broke the walls, they could walk throughout the whole city (since it was considered as one enclosure). Now, even after the walls are broken, when you have many different alleyways and courtyards open to this courtyard (we still consider them as one enclosure) that they walk through all of them like four Amos.

Abaya brings a proof "they made a great feast there so that they should have incentive to go. (So, it means that they had it good.) The Gemara rejects this perhaps they had both (good from the feast, but pain from the cramped quarters).

New Sugya

How do you interrogate the witnesses? They took the first pair to arrive and interrogate them first. They took the greater of the two and ask him to describe how he saw the moon. Was it before the sun or after the sun? Was it to the north or to the south of the sun? (Assumingly, in the beginning of the month, it's so small, so you would only be able to see it with the sun by sunset. So, since it refers to when the sun's in the west, it's not applicable to say on the east or west of the sun, but rather it's only asking to the north or the south. The Gemara will ask that these two questions are the same, was it to the north or south, so why mention both?) How high was it in the sky? Which direction was it pointing? How wide was the moon? If he claims it to be before the sun, he didn't say anything (since he's obviously lying).

Afterwards they brought in the second witness and interrogate him. If their testimony matches, their testimony stands. We ask the other pairs basic questions, not because we need to (get the information), but so that they don't leave disappointed (that they came for no reason), so they should continue to come.

The Gemara asks: isn't "before the sun" the same as being in the north? Isn't "after the sun" the same as being in the south?

Abaya answers: (the definition of before or after the sun is) does the moon's crescent face the sun or face away from the sun. If he says that it faces the sun, he didn't say anything (since he's obviously lying). As R' Yochanan says: what does the Pasuk mean by "the ruling and the fear is with him, he makes peace above?" That the sun never saw the crescent of the moon nor the crescent of the rainbow. It didn't see the crescent of the moon (since the sun caused its descent) it would cause the moon such depression for the sun to see when its missing.

Daf 24a

It didn't see the crescent of the rainbow so that the sun worshippers shouldn't say that their god is shooting arrows.

Tosfos says: you don't need to worry that the moon shouldn't see the crescent of the rainbow. After all, a rainbow is only visible by day, and the moon is like a candle in the daytime. Therefore, (Since the moon is not useful then) its worshippers won't say that its shooting arrows.