

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Rosh Hashana Daf 19
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
limudtorah.onlinewebshop.net
Subscribe free or Contact: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Many thanks to Dr. and Mrs. Mark Solway for dedicating this Daf

R' Acha b. Huna says: (in the Megila Tannis it says) on the third of Tishrei, they were able to stop people writing Hashem's name in documents. Originally, the Greek kingdom decreed that they can't mention Hashem. When the Chashminoim won, they decreed to mention Hashem's name even in documents. They wrote "in such and such year of Yochanan Kohain Gadol to the High G-d." However, when the Chachumim heard about this, they said "perhaps, the loan will be paid in the future, (and they'll throw out the document) and it will be laying in the garbage heap (along with the name of Hashem)." They managed to stop people from continuing this, and they made a holiday to celebrate it (since they felt it was a miracle for the populace to accept this from them). Anyhow, if it's true that they canceled the first holidays, would they add on new holidays? The Gemara answers: we refer to when the Beis Hamikdash was still standing.

Daf 19a

The Gemara asks: (if so, why do you need to enact a new holiday?) Why don't you say you can't fast because it was the day the Gedalya b. Achikam was killed (which was a holiday when the Beis Hamikdash stood)? **[Tosfos explains: it was a day of joy and a holiday when the Beis Hamikdash stood. The one who holds that they canceled the Megila Taanis, that's only after the destruction.]**

The Gemara answers: it's only needed to forbid the day before it (since the holidays of Megila Taanis forbids fasting the day before and after). The Gemara asks: why don't we anyhow say that it's the day after Rosh Chodesh (i.e., Rosh Hashana, and we forbid fasting the day after a holiday). The Gemara answers: Rosh Chodesh is from the Torah, so it doesn't need to strengthen its laws (to forbid fasting the day before and after). As we learned in a Braisa: the days written in Megila Taanis, you're even forbidden to fast the day before and afterwards. By Shabbos and Yom Tov, (you're only forbidden to fast that day) and not the day before and after. What's the difference between them? Shabbos and Yom Tov are sanctioned by the Torah, which doesn't need to be strengthened. While those other days are only a rabbinical invention, so they need to be strengthened (for people not to take lightly).

Tosfos explains: (it's only forbidden the day before and after), regarding fasting, but it's permitted to eulogize. As it says in Taanis: we learned; from Rosh Chodesh until the eighth of Nissan, where they established the Korban Tamid (to be brought from the community, and they won out the Tzidukim who wanted to bring it from private funds), you can't even eulogize. The Gemara asks there: (why say from Rosh Chodesh?) Why not say it from the second of Nissan? After all, Rosh Chodesh is anyhow forbidden to eulogize. The Gemara answers: in order to forbid the day before. After all, Rosh Chodesh is a day designated by the Torah, so it doesn't forbid the day before, since it doesn't need to be strengthened. The Gemara then asks: why don't you say the day before Rosh Chodesh is anyhow forbidden since it's the day after the twenty eighth of Adar? The Gemara answers: R' Assi says that it's only forbidden to fast the day after a holiday and not to forbid eulogizing. However, since this day (the twenty-ninth) is sandwiched between two Yomim Tovim, they made it have the status of a Yom Tov (and they forbid eulogies). This implies, if it wasn't for being given the status of a Yom Tov, it wouldn't be forbidden to make a eulogy although it's the

day before Rosh Chodesh Nissan when they established the Korban Tamid that they decreed not to eulogize on that day. Therefore, R' Ashi wasn't exact when he said "that the day after you can eulogize" but the same applies to the day before. He only said it exclusively on the day afterwards, since that was the topic he was talking about.

We can make the implications from here that, what it says that Shabbos and Yomim Tovim are forbidden, but are permitted before and afterwards, that's regarding fasting, (since eulogizing is permitted even before and after rabbinical days). Therefore, that Braisa is like R' Yossi who holds in Eiruvim that you may fast, and even finish the fast by the evening, on Erev Shabbos. Alternatively, it could be like the Rabanan who argue with him (and say that you can't finish the fast, and need to eat before nightfall not to go into Shabbos hungry) and it refers to fasting without finishing.

Tosfos asks: if we refer to fasting without finishing, then it should be permitted on the actual rabbinical holidays too. As it says there that R' Elazar b. Tzadok says that I was from the descendants of Sinav b. Binyamin (who's day for bringing wood to the Mikdash was on the tenth of Av, which became a Yom Tov for them.) When Tisha B'av fell out on Shabbos and was pushed off to Sunday, and we fasted without finishing since it was their Yom Tov.

Tosfos answers: Tisha B'av is more stringent than other fasts. A proof is: it says there that a rabbinical Yom Tov is different than Shabbos, after all, since you can fast for some hours during it (as long as you don't complete it), you can fast completely the day before. (Thus, Shabbos that you don't fast at all, you can't finish the Taanis the day before). Anyhow, this seems like a contradiction to our Gemara that forbids the day before and after the rabbinic holidays. So, to reconcile this, we must say there is different since it was Tisha B'av.

Tosfos is bothered by the question: the Gemara there brings a proof from the case of Tisha B'av that falls out on Erev Shabbos that R' Yossi says that you need to complete the fast until nightfall, to the opinion of the household of Rav that holds you can fast the whole Erev Shabbos. However, what's the comparison? We already said that Tisha B'av is stricter than any other Taanis.

Tosfos answers: it compares it that we don't consider it a Taanis (on Shabbos) by entering Shabbos when you're starving. After all, (you wouldn't be able to finish Tisha B'av if it's considered such) since Shabbos supersedes Tisha B'av. So, if we would consider it a Taanis, we would forbid it. Thus, it's a proof that it's not considered fasting on Shabbos. Therefore, you would be able to complete even a private fast.

The Gemara asks: (if it's all dependent if it's from the Torah or if it's rabbinic, since Tzum Gedalya is rabbinic), we're back to asking; why not say the prohibition of fasting is because of the day before Gedalya b. Achikam was killed? (So, why do you need to establish another holiday then?)

R' Ashi answers: the fast of Gedalya b. Achikam is brought in the Novi, and items from the Novi has a status like items from the Torah (and doesn't need to be strengthened).

R' Tuvi b. Masna asks: (in Megila Taanis it says) on the twenty-eighth (of Adar) a good tiding came to the Jews, that they don't need to break away from the Torah. After all, there was the king's decree that Jews shouldn't learn Torah and not to give their sons Milah and that they should desecrate Shabbos. What did Yehuda b. Shamua and his colleagues do? They took counsel from a certain noblewoman who the greatest Romans were always by her. She advised them to scream out (their plight) by night (when all the noblemen will hear and should take pity on you). They went to scream out at night "For G-d sakes, we're not brothers

and we don't come from the same father or mother. Why are we chosen from all other people to be discriminated with harsh decrees?" Eventually, they canceled those decrees. On that day, they made a Yom Tov. So, if you say that they canceled the earlier Yomim Tovim, does it make sense for them adding an extra Yom Tov? If you want to answer that this also happened before the Beis Hamikdash's destruction, that can't be. After all, we see that Yehuda b. Shamma was a student of R' Meir who lived after the destruction.

Tosfos asks: we brought the Gemara in Taanis that asks: why do we need to say that the twenty-ninth (of Adar) is forbidden because it's before the holiday of the Tamid, since it should be prohibited anyhow because it's after the holiday of the twenty-eighth (of Adar)? What's the question? After all, the holiday of the Tamid was instituted when the Beis Hamikdash stood, and the Yom Tov of the twenty-eighth happened many years later in the days of Yehuda b. Shamma who was a student of R' Meir. (Therefore, you can't ask why did they need to enact Rosh Chodesh Nissan for the twenty ninth if it's anyhow prohibited because it's after the twenty eighth, if they didn't institute the twenty eighth as a Yom Tov until after they established Rosh Chodesh Nissan.)

Tosfos answers: still, Rabbi who later wrote the order of the Mishnayos (including Megila Taanis) shouldn't have mentioned enacting Rosh Chodesh since it wasn't necessary anymore in his days.

As we learned a Mishna: a glass utensil that got a hole, and you plug it with molten lead; R' Shimon b. Elazar says Yehuda b. Shamma quotes R' Meir that it's susceptible to Tumah. The Chachumim say it's not susceptible.

Tosfos asks: why do the Chachumim say it's not susceptible to Tumah? After all, (even if it doesn't have the status of a lead utensil) it should be susceptible to Tumah by being a glass utensil, as the Gemara in Shabbos says that the rabbis enacted that it's susceptible to Tumah.

Rashi answers: they argue in a case where (a Tamai utensil breaks and is no longer Tamai since it's no longer a utensil, and is fixed), does the original Tumah return to it. Yehuda b. Shamma holds that the Tumah returns, even if it hadn't touched any Tumah (after the fixing). Even though we don't say the Tumah of glass utensils returns, as it says there in Shabbos, that they only enacted that the Tumah returns by a metal utensil, since the lead holds the utensil together, it gets the status as a metal utensil. He holds a utensil follows the material that holds it together. (See Tosfos there in Shabbos who explains it as the material that holds the item that's placed in the utensil). However, the Chachumim say it's not Tamai, since it's mostly a glass utensil and he doesn't hold we follow the material that holds it together.

Tosfos asks: since the original Tumah preceded the inserting of the lead, (so the original Tumah happened to a glass utensil), why would it help that you inserted the lead at the end?

Rashi gave another answer: R' Yehuda b. Shamma says that it becomes Tamai like a metal utensil that it receives Tumah from the Torah, if Tumah touches it, since we follow what holds the utensil together. However, the Chachumim say that it's not Tamai like a metal utensil, but only like a glass utensil.

Tosfos disagrees with this explanation. He says that it's difficult, since the implication of it being Tahor is that it's completely Tahor (even from rabbinic Tumah).

R' Shmuel explains: that they argue whether the inserting the molten lead will make a good

enough plug up (to consider the utensil whole in order that it can be susceptible for Tumah) or not. Although our text reads in Shabbos that “it’s R’ Meir who follows what holds the utensil together,” R’ Shmuel says that the text should only read “it’s R’ Meir” and no more. The text shouldn’t say “it follows what holds the utensil together.”

However, Tosfos says: this can’t be. As it seems in the Tosfeta of Keilim. As we learned: a stone cup that got a hole and they dropped molten lead into it (to plug it up). R’ Yossi quotes R’ Yochanan b. Nuri who says that it’s Tamai because it’s (like) a glass utensil (that’s only Tamai rabbinically). R’ Shimon b. Gamliel says that Yehua b. Shamua quotes R’ Meir that it’s Tamia. This implies like the last explanation of Rashi (that they argue whether the Tumah is rabbinic by being a glass utensil, or is it from the Torah like a metal one). Thus, we’ll say that the Rabanan here hold like R’ Yochanan b. Nuri (in the Tosefta), (and when they say it’s Tahor), they don’t mean it to be completely Tahor.

Alternatively, the Rabbis here (regarding glass) hold like R’ Meir regarding the stone utensil, that it’s Tamai like a metal utensil. The reason they hold that glass utensils (with the lead) don’t have the status of metal Tumah like they do (in a similar situation) with a stone utensil; since stone utensils have no Tumah, therefore, they needed to give it a status of metal so that it could have Tumah. However, glass utensils are susceptible to Tumah in some aspect, they didn’t think it was necessary to change the Tumah.

Riva answers: the Chachumim held that these utensils are completely Tahor (can’t receive Tumah). After all, the Gemara in Shabbos says that they decreed Tumah to glass since it’s like an earthenware utensil (since it’s made from sand). We also learned in the Tosefta of Keilim: that once an earthenware utensil becomes Tahor for one moment (by breaking) it will not become Tamai again (since it can’t be fully fixed).

However, this explanation can’t be true, as it seems at the end of the Tosefta, that it’s not completely Tahor, as we already explained.

Another question: how do we know the reason for R’ Meir is because he follows the material holding the utensil together, perhaps, he just doesn’t hold of that logic (that glass is like earthenware that it can’t be fixed). This may be true even if he fixed the glass with pitch (that it’s Tamai because you fixed the original utensil and not because it’s now a metal utensil). After all, they argue in the Tosefta in Keilim by this very case (of plugging the utensil with pitch).

Also, the Rabanan say this (i.e., that it can’t be fixed) by a piece of earthenware that broke off from a big barrel, but it has enough there (to be considered an independent utensil) and it then gets a hole and they plugged it with pitch. However, it doesn’t apply to a complete utensil, as the Tosefta says.

Another question: the conclusion of the Gemara in Shabbos is not like this (that glass was enacted because it’s like earthenware). Rather, since it can be repaired when it breaks (that you can smelt it down and form it again), it’s similar to metal, (and they enacted it to be like a metal utensil).

Daf 19b

The Gemara answers: it’s a Tannaic argument. As we learned: R’ Meir says: it’s forbidden to fast on those holidays written in the Megila Taanis whether the Mikdash is standing or not. However, R’ Yossi says

that it's only forbidden when the Mikdash stood, since they're days of joys then, and not when it's destroyed, because they're days of mourning now.

The Gemara concludes that the Halacha is both that it's canceled, and it's not canceled. The Gemara asks: if so, it's a contradiction in the Halacha. The Gemara reconciles that they didn't cancel Chanukah and Purim, but they canceled the rest of the days.

New Sugya

The Mishna says that the agents went out on Elul and Tishrei. The Gemara asks: since they left on Elul (to make known when is Rosh Hashana), why must they go again for Tishrei (since we know when Rosh Hashana is)? If you'll say because of the possibility that they make Elul an extra day, that can't be. After all, R' Chanina b. Kahana quotes Rav that, since the days of Ezra, we don't find that Elul was made an extra day.

Tosfos says: this implies that they had an extra day in Elul during the days of Ezra. We have somewhat of a proof from the P'sukim to this. It says "it reached the seventh month (Tishrei) etc. and Ezra the Kohain brought the Torah etc. on the first day of the seventh month etc. and he read from it etc. and he said 'this day is holy' etc. On the second day, all the elders of the people and the Kohanim and Leviyim gathered unto Ezra the scribe to understand the words of Torah." This implies that they made two days Rosh Hashana, and the reason why it's called "the second" (although it was the first of Tishrei) but the second day of that aspect (i.e., of Rosh Hashana).

It's also written "on the twenty fourth of the month, all the Jews gathered to fast and to wear sack clothes." It must be because it was right after Sukkos they gathered, and if it wasn't that they added a day to Elul, and they made Sukkos on the fifteenth (from the first day of Rosh Hashana) then (with the fourteen days before Sukkos plus the eight days of Sukkos would be twenty two days) and the day after Sukkos would be day twenty three (and they should have fasted then). You can't say that they pushed off the fast until the twenty fourth because it was the day after Yom Tov (i.e., Issur Chag). After all, they weren't accustomed to keep Issur Chag at that time in history. Also, (even if they kept Issur Chag), this was a community fast (and it should supersede Issur Chag). Rather, we must say it's a proof that they added a day to Elul.

The Gemara answers: they never found it to be that way without having a reason that they needed it to be that way, but if they needed to push off Rosh Hashana, they did so.

The Gemara asks: but aren't they ruining Rosh Hashana (for those who think it would be the first day. The Gemara answers: it's better to ruin Rosh Hashana for them than to ruin the Yomim Tovim. The Gemara concludes: the Mishna also infers this, as it says that they go out on Tishrei for the fixing of the Yomim Tovim.

(Rashi explains ruining the Yomim Tovim by having them fall next to Shabbos, and by that, you might need to leave someone who dies from being buried an extra day or that you need to pick the vegetables a day earlier and it needs to remain fresh for an extra day, as the Gemara will say later that these are reasons to push off Rosh Hashana.)

Tosfos asks: this makes sense at least to the opinion that we push it off because of vegetables, that it applies to all Yom Tovim (that fall next to Shabbos, so that's why the Mishna mentions them in the plural). However, according to the one who says that it's only because of the dead, it's very

difficult (why it lists “Yomim Tovim” in the plural). After all, it will only ruin by Yom Kippur (since non-Jews may bury the dead on other Yomim Tovim).

Another question: once they know when Elul will be, why would it ruin in for them if they don't know when Beis Din made Rosh Hashana (and they'll need to be in doubt which day it was). However, (if the only problem was not to have the Yomim Tovim next to Shabbos), everyone knows the rule that they'll push it off for that reason if it would fall on the days that have the acronym 'Ado' (Sunday, Wednesday and Friday. So, if Rosh Hashana fell on those days, they'll automatically know that Beis Din will push it off.)

Therefore, Tosfos explains: we don't refer to here if they need to push it off because it would fall on 'Ado.' Rather, we need to push it off since the witnesses hadn't seen the new moon on the thirtieth day of Elul. Therefore, they didn't make the beginning of the next month (by calling it 'Kodesh') until the thirty first, since there is a Mitzvah to establish the new month by witnesses seeing the moon. On that, the Gemara asks: but aren't you ruining Rosh Hashana? I.e., you're making people need to make two days of Rosh Hashana because of the doubt (when they'll designate the day for Rosh Hashana). On that, the Gemara answers: it's better for them to ruin Rosh Hashana (in that aspect) than to ruin all the Yomim Tovim, i.e., Yom Kippur, Sukkos and Shmini Atzeres, if you established Rosh Hashana by threatening people (to testify on the new moon even though they didn't see it) and not by having witnesses actually see the moon.

New Sugya

The Gemara observes that our Mishna doesn't list that Beis Din's agents went out during a leap year to tell when Adar Sheini was. This Mishna is not like Rabbi who holds that, if the year is a leap year, they went out to inform about Adar Sheini so that they should know when Purim is.

Tosfos asks: according to the Tanna of our Mishna that they didn't go out to tell us when Adar Sheini is, how did they know that they made it a leap year? It would make sense if they decided to make it a leap year before Adar, then the agents can inform them when they visited to tell them. However, if they made the decision to make a leap year afterwards, then, how will they know that it's a leap year? After all, you can decide to make it a leap year all Adar, or, at least until Purim.

Tosfos answers: since agents go out to inform when was Nissan, they would understand that it's a leap year when agents don't go out when it reaches Rosh Chodesh. They'll deduce that it must be a leap year.

The Gemara suggests: perhaps they argue whether all the Mitzvos relevant to the second Adar (Purim etc.) could be performed on the first Adar too or not. (After all, if it could be performed on the first Adar, then they were Yoitza then and you don't need to know when Purim is during Adar Sheini.)

Tosfos' text reads “one holds that all the Mitzvos that you do on the first month you do it on the second month.” Their reasons are learned from P'sukim brought in the first Perek of Megila. Most texts of our Gemara reads “one holds that all Mitzvos that one does on the second can be done on the first. The other holds that you can't do them.” This is also the text in the Gemara in the first Perek of Megila regarding the argument between the Rabanan, R' Elazar b. R' Yossi and R' Shimon b. Gamliel. Both texts can be explained into the Gemara.

The Gemara rejects this as the only possible explanation: perhaps, everyone holds that Mitzvos

relevant to the second Adar can't be performed on the first Adar. However, they argue what's the setup of the leap year. As we learned: how long is (the first Adar) of the leap year? The Tanna Kama says that it's thirty days and R' Shimon b. Gamliel says that it's a 'month' (i.e., twenty-nine days). (Therefore, we see that the Tanna Kama held it to be a set amount, so you should know when Adar Sheini starts.) The Gemara asks: why is the opinion of thirty days (don't need agents informing) since everyone knows when it would be, different than the opinion of a 'month' (i.e., twenty-nine days) since everyone also knows when it would be. R' Pappa answers: the opinion who holds it's a 'month,' he means that if they want they could make it a 'month' (i.e., twenty-nine days) and if they want they could make it thirty days.

R' Yehoshua b. Levi testified in the name of the holy community of Yerushalayim that we Mikadesh both Adars on the thirtieth day (lit. the day that could be added on extra to the month). The Gemara says: this mean we only make them into short months and not full months. This is contrary to the opinion of R' Nachman b. Chisda that R' Simai testified (that it was said in the name of) Chagai, Zechrya and Melachai that if you want you may make both of them full months, or both short months, or one month full and the other short. This was the custom in the Diaspora. They quote 'Rabbienu' we always assume that one Adar is full and one Adar is short until it becomes known (from agents informing us) that they established Rosh Chodesh (Adar Sheini) in its time (i.e., on the thirtieth day, and Adar Rishon will be short).

They sent to Mar Ukavah the Adar next to Nissan is always a short month.

Tosfos asks: if so, why did they go out on Nissan because of Pesach? (After all, they know when Pesach will be.) However, the Gemara's conclusion disproves this anyhow. Even so, nowadays, this is how we're accustomed to set up the calendar. It's only in the olden days when they Mekadesh the month through witnesses seeing the new moon, that's when the Gemara concludes that it was sometimes a full month and sometimes short (depending when witnesses come). However, nowadays, it's better to make the first Adar full, since it's the extra month (so we make it a big addition), even though we say that the year is extra at its end (it just means that an Adar is extra, but not necessarily the last Adar).

However, the Yerushalmi implies that this is an argument. Since it says there that Ukva found two (ancient) letters (informing about the coming leap year). One said "it was a good idea to me and my colleagues to add onto the year thirty days." In the other it says "it was a good idea to me and my colleagues to add onto the year a month of days (i.e. twenty nine days)." The one who said that it was thirty days held that the first one is the extra month (so we make it full). The one who holds that it was twenty-nine days held that Adar Sheini is the extra month. At the end, the Yerushalmi rejects this conclusion and just says that it's optional how many days to add, and sometimes it's thirty days and sometimes twenty nine.

R' Nachman asks: a Mishna says that witnesses desecrated Shabbos in order to testify on the new moon by two months, Nissan and Tishrei. Therefore, it makes sense if we say that we sometimes make Adar full and sometimes short, then it makes sense why they desecrate Shabbos, in order to figure out what date should we establish Nissan.

Daf 20a

However, if you say that it's always made into a short month, why would they desecrate Shabbos (if Rosh Chodesh would be the same day regardless)? The Gemara answers: because it's a special Mitzvah to sanctify the month through the testimony of witnesses.