

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Rosh Hashana Daf 20
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
limudtorah.onlinewebshop.net
Subscribe free or to sponsor: tosfosproject@gmail.com

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

R' Nachman asks: a Mishna says that witnesses desecrate 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, 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.

Another Version: R' Nachman says that I also learned a Mishna that's a proof to this (that they were always short). As the Mishna says that on two months they desecrated Shabbos to testify, on Nissan and Tishrei. This makes sense if we say that it's always short, that's why it's necessary to desecrate Shabbos for the testimony (to make sure it falls on the right date). However, if you can make it sometimes full and sometimes short, why desecrate the Shabbos? After all, just add a day to the month, and sanctify the month on the next day.

The Gemara answers: if the thirtieth day fell on Shabbos, we should do that. However, this Mishna refers when the thirty first is on Shabbos, and (although it will be Rosh Chodesh then even if witnesses don't testify) it's a Mitzvah to sanctify the month with witnesses.

R' Kahana asks: the Mishna also says, when the Beis Hamikdash stood, they desecrated Shabbos for all months in order to fix the right days to bring the Korbonos (Musuf). (Therefore, we don't just desecrate Shabbos just to sanctify these months through testimony.) So, just like they didn't desecrate Shabbos in these months in order to sanctify the month through testimony, they didn't desecrate for Nissan and Tishrei to sanctify through testimony either. Therefore, it makes sense that Adar could be either full or short, therefore, we desecrate Shabbos so it should fall on the right day. However, if you say that it's only a short month, why must we desecrate Shabbos (if we know which day it will fall out on). This is a disproof. (Therefore, the Adar next to Nissan was not always a short month.)

New Sugya

When Ullah came to Eretz Yisrael, he said that they could make Elul a full month. Ullah says: our colleagues in Bavel know what favor we do for them (when we add a day to Elul). The Gemara asks: what's the favor?

Tosfos explains the question: what is the favor for occasionally adding onto Elul? After all, it's better not to push it off ever so that they wouldn't need to keep two days for the doubt which day is the true Rosh Hashana.

Ullah says: because of the vegetables (that they shouldn't wilt after two days of not being able to pick fresh ones. Therefore, they pushed Yom Tov off a day in order that it shouldn't fall on a day next to Shabbos.) R' Acha b. Chanina says it's because the dead (so they shouldn't decompose waiting to get buried). The practical difference between the opinions is when Yom Kippur falls out after Shabbos. You push it off according to the opinion because of the dead, but not for the vegetables. After all, you only need the vegetables for Motzei Yom Kippur, so you can pick vegetables then.

The Gemara asks: if so, the opinion who holds it's because of vegetables (and it's not applicable in this case), why shouldn't he hold that we shouldn't push it off because of the dead?

The Gemara answers: (really, in the above case, everyone holds to push it off because of the dead). Rather, the practical difference between them is Yom Tov (Sukkos) next to Shabbos, whether it occurs before or after Shabbos.

R' Tam says that the text shouldn't read that it falls before Shabbos, since, if Rosh Hashana and Sukkos fall before Shabbos (on Friday), you'll have a problem with the dead. After all, then Yom Kippur would fall out on Sunday.

According to the opinion because of the vegetables, you push it off. However, the opinion who holds because of the dead, you don't need to worry about them. After all, on Yom Tov you have permission to have non-Jews bury them.

The Gemara asks: according to the one who holds because of the dead, why wouldn't he add a day to avoid the wilted vegetables? The Gemara answers: because you can fix the vegetables by soaking them in warm water.

The Gemara asks: if so, why is it only a favor to them (Bavel)? It should be helpful to us (Eretz Yisrael) too. The Gemara answers: they're climate is very hot, but our climate is not that hot.

The Gemara asks: doesn't Rabbah b. Shmuel teach; I might say that, just like you can add (a month) to a year when needed, you can also add onto a month when needed (even without witnesses), so the Pasuk tells us otherwise. The Pasuk says "this month shall be for you the head of months." I.e., only if you see (the moon) like this (when it's new), and then sanctify it. (Otherwise, you can't sanctify it.)

Rava answers: it's not difficult. We say you could add on (a thirtieth day) to the month, but not to sanctify (the month early on the thirtieth day without testimony). This is how that Braisa was taught: I might say that, just as you add onto a year or a month when needed you can also sanctify the month early if needed, so the Pasuk says "this month shall be for you the head of months." I.e., only if you see (the moon) like this (when it's new), and then sanctify it. This is like R' Yehoshua b. Levi says that you scare witnesses that saw the new moon on the thirtieth not to testify so you can push it off a day but you can't scare them to testify on a new moon on the thirtieth day which they didn't see.

The Gemara asks: didn't R' Yehuda Nesia sent to R' Ami that R' Yochanan always taught that we scare witnesses to testify on the thirtieth, although the new moon wasn't seen, that they saw it.

Tosfos explains that this can't be the same R' Yehuda Nesia that permitted (non-Jewish made) oil as recorded in Mesechta Avodah Zara who were in the days of Rav and Shmuel. That R' Yehuda Nesia was the son of R' Gamliel the son of R' Yehuda Hanossi (i.e., Rebbi). However, this

R' Yehuda Nesia was a student of R' Yochanan and he was obedient to the opinions of Rav and Shmuel.

Abaya answers: it's not difficult. One refers to Nissan and Tishrei and the other refers to other months.

Tosfos quotes Rashi: since the Yomim Tovim are dependent on when these Rosh Chodeshim fall out, then we can sanctify them whenever you need to, (to make sure they fall out on the right time), but not for other months. However, other Meforshim say the opposite (that, since the Yomim Tovim are dependent on their Rosh Chodesh, we're compelled that they should be a more honest sanctifying through true testimony).

Rava answers the Braisa that we don't change a month's length for a need: the author of Rabbah b. Shmuel's Braisa is Acheirim who says that there is no difference between Shvuos or Rosh Hashana of one year and the same time for the next year but four days. (I.e., since there are always three hundred and fifty-four days in a year, and three hundred and fifty can be divided by seven, therefore, the next day would fall on the same day of the week as the first day of the year. Since you have four days left in the year, then, the next day, which is the first day of the next year, falls four days later in the week than the first day of the year before.) However, if it's a leap year (which adds an extra twenty-nine days, and since twenty-eight can be divided by seven, then this doesn't push it down the week but another day) there is five days between them. (therefore, he definitely holds you don't alternate the months at all).

Tosfos brings: the Gemara in Erichin asks; but don't you have the extra days "from the extra hours" and "from every thirty years?" After all, one year's (Molad of Tishrei) is longer than the earlier year's (Molad) is four days, eight hours and 876 Chalakim. (The hours add up for an extra day every three years.) The Chalakim add up to an extra day every thirty years.

The Gemara there answers: since it doesn't happen every year, Acheirim didn't mention it.

R' Dimi from Nahardah taught the opposite: we scare witnesses on a month that wasn't seen on the thirtieth to testify that they saw it, but not to scare witnesses not to testify on a new moon that was seen on the thirtieth so that they should add a day. What's the reason?

Daf 20b

The Gemara answers: this one looks like lying (since everyone knows that the new moon was out the day before) and this one doesn't look like lying (since, although you didn't see the new moon, perhaps these witnesses saw it).

Shmuel says: I could calculate the dates (of all Rosh Chodeshim) for the whole Diaspora (without hearing from witnesses). Abba the father of R' Simlai asked him; do you know what it's taught in the Braisos of the "Secrets of Adding onto a Month," that there is a difference if the Molad happened before or after midnight? He answered in the negative. He said: just like you don't know this statement (though it might not affect your calculation), there may be other statements that you're not aware of. (So, you can't rely on your calculations.)

When R' Zeira went up to Eretz Yisrael, he sent back to Bavel; you need to have a full night and day from the new moon. (I.e., when the moon is invisible, and that the night precedes the day in this aspect.)

Tosfos explains: that which we scare the witnesses to testify they saw the moon on the thirtieth although they didn't see it, that's only when the night and day of the thirtieth was part of the new (i.e., when the moon was invisible).

This is what Abba the father of R' Simlai said that you calculate the Molad. If it was before midnight, you can be sure that the moon was seen before sunset that day. If the Molad was not before midnight, then you know the new moon wasn't seen before sunset (but the next night). The Gemara asks: what difference does it make (if we anyhow only establish Rosh Chodesh through testimony)? R' Ashi answers: in order to be able to contradict witnesses (who testify they saw it before sunset when the Molad was after midnight).

R' Zeira quotes R' Nachman: the moon is covered (invisible) for twenty-four hours. For us in Bavel, it's six hours of the old moon and eighteen hours of the new moon. For the people in Eretz Yisrael, it's eighteen hours of the old moon and six hours of the new moon. (The old moon is in the East, therefore, it's easier to be seen by Bavel that's in the East. The new moon is in the West, so it's easier to be seen by Eretz Yisrael that's in the West.) The Gemara asks: what difference does it make (if we anyhow only establish Rosh Chodesh through testimony)? R' Ashi answers: in order to be able to contradict witnesses.

We already learned: you need to have a night and day from the new moon (being invisible in order to sanctify it). How do we know this (that the night precedes the days regarding the Yomim Tovim)? R' Yochanan learns it from the Pasuk by Yom Kippur "from evening to evening." Reish Lakish says from the Pasuk by Matzos "until the twenty first of the month at night." What's the practical difference between the two opinions? Abaya says (there is no practical difference), but they're only arguing which Pasuk to learn it from. Rava says: the practical difference is about midnight. (The opinion that learns it from eating voluntarily Matzos on Pesach, that only starts after midnight on the first night. Before that, he has an obligation to eat Matzos. Therefore, it doesn't need to be invisible until midnight and you still can sanctify it that day.)

Tosfos quotes Rashi: he saw in R' Sadya Gaon's "foundations" that the moon, right before it becomes new (i.e., at the end of the old moon), it's in the Southeast, and after it becomes new, it's in the Southwest. Therefore, when it's in the East, it's noticeable to the people in the East and not to the people in the West, and when it's in the west, it's noticeable to the people in the West and not to the people of the East. Therefore, the old moon is not invisible to the Babylonians who are in the East but for six hours, but to the people of Eretz Yisrael that are far (in the West) it's covered for eighteen hours. However, the new moon is not invisible to the people of Eretz Yisrael in the West but for six hours, and to the people in Bavel that are far (in the East) it's invisible for eighteen hours.

The one who learns it from Yom Kippur, then the day follows the beginning of the night, so, if the old moon was seen at the beginning of the night, you can't sanctify that day as Rosh Chodesh. However, according to the one who holds that we learn from Pesach, we don't need to worry unless the moon was seen from midnight and on.

Tosfos says: according to Rashi's opinion, we don't worry what the people in Bavel saw, but only what the people in Eretz Yisrael saw. Therefore, even if the Babylonians saw the moon that night, the people of Eretz Yisrael may sanctify the moon the next day, and you don't need to worry what the Babylonians seen. Thus, even the Babylonians count the days for Yom Kippur and the other holidays from that day that the Jews of Eretz Yisrael saw the new moon, despite seeing the old moon that night.

Tosfos asks: why is the Pasuk (that's worried that the moon shouldn't have been seen the

night before), only worried about the people of Eretz Yisrael and not of Bavel? (After all, the Pasuk says it can't be seen, implies in all places.)

Furthermore, when the moon starts to wane, you never see it at the beginning of the night until it becomes new. After all, the way it works, when the moon is new, it's seen in the beginning of the night and then sets right away. The next night, it stays a little longer in the sky until it sets. It adds more time (to its being in the sky) until it's full. Then it rises at the beginning of the night and shines the whole night until the morning, when it sets. From that time on, it starts to wane. At that time, it waits to rise (and doesn't rise) at the beginning of the night. Every continuous night, it further waits to rise until the end of the month. The whole time it's not in the sky at night, it's up during the day (when you can't notice it because of the daylight) to make up the twelve hours, whether it's at the beginning of the month or at the end.

However, Tosfos says: it seems that it would be better to explain the Gemara to refer to the Molad, that you need the night and day to be in the new moon, and the Molad needed to be before dark on the twenty ninth, so that the whole night and day of the thirtieth would be after the Molad. However, the Minhag is not that way. After all, we don't invalidate a Molad unless it falls after eighteen hours in the day (and won't be seen that day at all).

Others explain: you need to have the "night and the day" in the new moon, and not "the day and the night." So, if the Molad happened before midday, and thus Beis Din sanctified the month, then the night before it was retroactively sanctified along with it. However, if the Molad is after midday, and the moon won't be seen today, then they only sanctified the next day, and the day before doesn't become sanctified retroactively along with it (since the day follows the night, but the night doesn't follow the day before it, but is a new day). This comes out to explain R' Simlai's father (and there is no argument).

However, Tosfos concludes that the Gemara's statement "the difference between them is midnight" doesn't fit well to this explanation. After all, there is no opinion that Yom Tov or Rosh Chodesh doesn't start at (the beginning of the night) when it gets dark.

New Sugya

R' Zeira quotes R' Nachman: all doubts (for the Diaspora for when Yom Tov falls out) is only for further days (and not for earlier days). This means to say that they only keep the fifteenth and sixteenth as Yom Tov, but not the fourteenth. The Gemara asks: let us also keep the fourteenth for, perhaps, they made Av and Elul into short months.

Daf 21a

The Gemara answers: if there were two short months in a row, (which is so uncommon), it would produce rumors of it (and they would have heard about it).