

**Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Rosh Hashana Daf 3**  
**By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz**  
**Tosfos.ecwid.com**  
**Subscribe free or Contact: tosfosproject@gmail.com**

**Daf 3a**

As the Pasuk says “and Kanan the king of Arud heard.” What news did he hear? He heard that Aharon died and the clouds of glory was removed from the Jews, and they thought this to be a sign that they may battle with the Jews.

**Tosfos quotes a Medrish that it was really Amaleik. This is like the poet wrote in his Yotzar for Parshas Zachor; he changed his clothing and language to be similar to Arad. [See Maharsha- he changed his clothing from the language they spoke, but he didn't change both to be like Sichon, as Rashi explains in Chumash.]**

(Tosfos is bothered, if it's not really Sichon, how can the Gemara bring a proof about Sichon?)

**Tosfos answers: we can bring a proof that Sichon lived, since Amaleik was impersonating him (and the Jews won't be fooled if they already conquered him).**

**Tosfos concludes: the Gemara makes this Drasha from the Pasuk in Massai, for if it would Darshen the Pasuk in Chukos, (it couldn't say any other thing they heard) since it says explicitly that they heard that the Jews were coming in the spies' path. Rashi, (who wrote this Drasha in Chukos), did not check out the source well.**

This is like the Pasuk says “(Vayirau) the nation saw that (Ki) Aharon died.” R' Avahu explains, don't read Vayirau (they saw) but Vayiru (they were exposed, i.e., seen by others). [Therefore, the end of the Pasuk means they were exposed because Aharon died.] As Reish Lakish says that the word Ki has four meanings; ‘if,’ ‘perhaps,’ ‘but’ and ‘because.’

**Tosfos explains: i.e., they were exposed because Aharon died. Therefore, it's using Ki to mean ‘because.’ After all, (if you learn the Pasuk) that Vayiru comes from the verb of seeing, it doesn't fit well to explain ‘Ki’ with any of those four definitions.**

**Tosfos asks: perhaps you can use it to mean ‘when,’ i.e., and they saw when Aharon died. This would be similar to “and Yosef's brothers saw when their father died, and said, perhaps (Yosef's) going to remove us.” Or, “the Philistim saw when their strong one died.”**

Tosfos answers; perhaps it doesn't fit in as well here as it fits in those other P'sukim.

Tosfos is bothered by the question: wouldn't this be a fifth definition?

**Tosfos answers: that, which we explain the Pasuk with the definition of ‘when,’ like “when Pharaoh's horse came,” or, “when you'll be fruitful and multiply,” this is not a fifth definition, like Rashi explains, since all times it's defined as ‘when’ (like, “when you come”, “when you go,” “when you carry,” and “when you end”), is defined as ‘Im’ (which usually means ‘if’). After all, we find many places where the Torah says ‘Im’ and it means ‘when.’ Like “and ‘Im’ will be Yovel.” This means when Yovel comes. (You can't define it as ‘if’ Yovel comes) since it will definitely come. The same by “ ‘Im’ you bring your Bikkurim close,” it means when you bring it, since (it can't be if you bring)**

since it's an obligation to bring.

However, what Rashi says that the word 'Asher' connoted 'if' is not true. However, in Gitten, Rashi writes it means 'because.' That is the true definition.

The next Tosfos explains: "Ki you come", "Ki you chance," "Ki you see", or Ki you meet" are all defined as 'if,' and so is the definition of most (times it says Ki).

However, when it says "Ki you say in your heart" can't mean 'if.' After all, then it would imply that if you say in your heart (they have a mighty army) don't fear them, but if you don't say that, then you should fear them. Therefore, you need to define it as 'perhaps.' I.e., that, perhaps you'll say that there are a lot of non-Jews etc., then, don't say that. The same applies to the P'sukim "Ki say what's pursuing you" and "Ki say what will we eat" and "Ki see your enemy's donkey etc. (They're all terms of 'perhaps.') The same for "Ki Aharon died" (doesn't mean 'if') but means 'because.'

The Gemara asks: how can you (bring a proof to Sichon's living)? After all, we're referring to Sichon and this king is called Kanan? The Gemara answers: we were taught; Sichon was Arud and was Kanan (they were aliases). He was called Sichon since he was like a pony in the wilderness, he was called Kanan because that's who he ruled over and his real name was Arud.

**Tosfos points out: the simple meaning of the Pasuk that Arad is the name of the country or the name of his city.**

Others say that he was called Arud since he was like a wild donkey in the wilderness, he was called Kanan because that's who he ruled over and his real name was Sichon.

The Gemara asks: perhaps Rosh Hashana is Iyar? The Gemara answers: it can't be, as it says it was on the first month in the second year, they set up the Mishkon. It says afterwards "and it was in the second year and in the second month, the cloud ascended from on the Mishkon." So, we see, when it referred to Nissan, it was called the second year, and when it referred to Iyar it still called it the second year. So, it's a proof that Iyar is not Rosh Hashana.

**Tosfos is bothered by the question: perhaps the Pasuk of Iyar (is not to the count of the Exodus) but to the building of the Mishkon, and we can still say that Iyar is the Rosh Hashana.**

**Tosfos answers: we know it's referring to the same count as the first Pasuk, since we have a Gezeira Shava between the two P'sukim that say "second year" the same we have for the "fortieth year" and "twentieth year."**

**However, Tosfos concludes: it could have brought as a definitive proof from a Pasuk in Bamidbar that says explicitly that the first day of the second month in the second year that the Jews left Egypt.**

The Gemara asks: perhaps Rosh Hashana is Sivan? The Gemara answers: it can't be. After all, the Pasuk says "on the third month from when the Jews left Egypt." If it's true (that it passed the Rosh Hashana) it should have said "the third month of the second year."

The Gemara asks: perhaps it's Tamuz or Av or Adar? R' Elazar says: really, we learn it from here: "and they finished building in the second month, in the second, in the fourth year of his kingdom." Why does it say a second time "in the second?" Doesn't it mean the second month that we count for his kingdom? The Gemara

attempts to push the proof off: no, it means the second day of the month. The Gemara counters that, if so, it should have written explicitly “the second of the month.” The Gemara again attempts to push off the proof: perhaps it means the second day of the week (i.e., Monday). The Gemara rejects this: first of all, the Torah never refers to the days of the week.

**Tosfos is bothered: but it says “it was morning, the second day.” (So, we see the Pasuk refers to Monday.)**

**Tosfos quotes the Yerushalmi that answers: we can’t bring a proof by the days of creation, since it’s not going on the days of the week, but the days of creation.**

Secondly, we have a Hekish between the first time it’s written “the second” in the Pasuk to the second time it’s written. Just as the first time refers to the month, so too the second time refers to the month. We have a Braisa that’s a proof to R’ Yochanan; and quotes it as it brings down all the P’sukim we tried to learn it from until its conclusion comes out to be our conclusion.

**Tosfos explains: this is not coming to say it’s not like R’ Elazar, since the Braisa brings R’ Elazar’s Pasuk too. However, it’s not enough to bring R’ Elazar’s Pasuk as a proof. After all, I might say they count Shlomo according to the month he was crowned, and he was crowned in Nissan, but we wouldn’t count other kings from then. Therefore, we need the Hekish between kings and the Jews leaving Egypt.**

R’ Chisda says: we don’t say (that Nissan is Rosh Hashana) but only to Jewish kings, but to non-Jewish kings, they count from Tishrei. As it says “the words of Nechemia b. Chakila, and it was in the month of Kisleiv in the twentieth year etc.” It also says “and it was in the month of Nissan in the twentieth year of (king) Artchashta.” Thus, when it refers to Kisleiv as being in the twentieth year, and then, referring to Nissan afterwards, it still calls it the twentieth year, it proves that Rosh Hashana is not Nissan.

**Tosfos is bothered by the question: there are many months between Nissan and Tishrei that could have been Rosh Hashana, so why assume it’s Tishrei more than other months?**

**Tosfos answers: once we see it’s not Nissan, we put it by Tishrei since it’s Rosh Hashana for many things, for Shmita and Yovel.**

The Gemara asks: it makes sense that the last Pasuk refers to a count from Artchashta’s reign (since it says so explicitly), but how do we know the first Pasuk refers to the count from Artchashta’s reign? perhaps it’s from another count.

### **Daf 3b**

R’ Pappa answers: there is a Gezeira Shava from the words of “twenty years.” Just like the last Pasuk is from Artchashta’s reign, so too the first Pasuk.

**Tosfos explains the Gemara’s question that perhaps it’s from another count: (i.e., the count is) from some story that happened.**

**Tosfos quotes the Yerushalmi: really, we count from Nissan, although it’s called the twentieth year for Kisleiv and then again by Nissan etc. (as we’ll see).**

**This is how it’s written in the Yerushalmi: R’ Yitzchok asks; [it says by the Mabul (that it**

started after Noach was six hundred years old, which would seem to be in his six hundredth and first year, since his six hundredth year ended by Nissan). It also says that he was six hundred and one when (the land dried. However, if the rains started in the second month, which is Iyar, how can it become dry on the first month of the six hundred and first year, but it rained during his six hundred and first year, it should have said it was dry in his six hundred and second year). So, we were taught that the year of the Mabul wasn't counted to his life (since it was so troublesome, it wasn't considered to be living). However, if we count by Tishrei, we can say that it didn't end the six hundredth year by Nissan, but it was still in middle of the six hundredth year until Tishrei. Therefore, he turned six hundred during the Mabul, and then it makes sense how it can be only the six hundred and first year the next year (and we wouldn't need the above answer), so, we must say that we count by Nissan.

The Yerushalmi answers: we can explain it like R' Eliezer who holds that the world was created in Tishrei. (Therefore, the second month was really Cheshvon, since we count the months and years from Tishrei, and therefore we can explain the same way as we explained by R' Yehoshua who holds the months and years are counted by Nissan.)]

The Yerushalmi then asks our Gemara's question: it says both Kisleiv and Nissan was in the twentieth year (so we must count by Tishrei), so the Gemara there answers: it's like R' Eliezer who says we don't consider the next year as a year until thirty days passed. (Therefore, since it was still in Nissan, so thirty days didn't pass, so it's still called by the old year.)

The Yerushalmi then asks: it says "it was in the first month in the second year on the first of the month, and the Mishkon was set up." (So, it's called the next year even without thirty days.) Even if you want to say that it was really of the third year, but the Torah only calls it the second year since thirty days didn't pass. (Tosfos explains the Yerushalmi's last point: if you want to push off the above proof that it was really the third year, but the Pasuk only count it the second year since thirty days didn't pass). However, the Pasuk says "it was the second year in the second month on the twentieth of the month, the cloud went up from above the Mishkon. (If this is really the third year), fifty days passed in the year and we don't count it for a full year.

The Gemara asks: how do we know that the story of Kisleiv happened first? Perhaps the story of Nissan came first, (and that's why they're in the same year, since we count the year by Nissan).

The Gemara answers: it can't be. After all, the words that Chanani told Nechemya in Kisleiv, Nechemya repeated them to the king in Nissan. (So, the story of Kisleiv was first.) As the Pasuk says: "these are the words of Nechemya; it was in the twentieth year in the month of Kisleiv, and I was in Shushon and one of my brothers, Chanani, came with others from Judea and I inquired about the remainder of the Jews left from the capture and on Yerushalayim, and he answered me; those who are left from the capture in the country is in bad straits, and is disgraced. The walls are broken and the gates were destroyed through fire." Nechemya repeated it to the king in Nissan as it says "it was in the month of Nissan in the twentieth year of Artchashta's reign. He had wine before him and I lifted the wine and handed it to the king. I was never sad before him earlier. The king asked me 'why is your face sad, and you're not sick? This is not but a pain in your heart.'" I feared him a lot. Then I said to him, "may the king live forever. Why shouldn't my face fall since the city where my ancestors are buried is destroyed and its gates consumed by fire." The king responded, "what would you like?" I prayed to Hashem. I told him "if it's good to the king, and if I find favor in your eyes, send me to Judea where my ancestors were buried, and I'll rebuild it. The king told me, as his queen was by his side, "how long would it take you to go and when will you return. The terms were good to the king, so he sent me and gave me a time to return."

Tosfos explains: the simple reading of the Pasuk that this story of Nechemya was done before

Artchashta, who was Daryavush the son of Esther who built the Mikdash in his day.

However, Tosfos says that this can't be, since the Mikdash was built in the sixth year of his rule, as it says that "they built the house etc. (in his sixth year)" and this was done in his twentieth year where the Jews already lived there safely (as Yerushalayim was already completely rebuilt).

Another problem, later, R' Yosef asks on R' Avahu who holds they counted Daryavush like a Jewish king, so he asks a contradiction from a completely different Pasuk. If this Pasuk refers to him (and this is in the same Parsha as the implication we count from Nissan), he should have asked a contradiction from this Pasuk that we count him from Tishrei.

Therefore, Tosfos explains: this was the twentieth year of Artchashta, who was also the original Koresh, which was now under the rule of Daryavush, he brought wine before him (referring to Daryavush the son of Esther). This happened three years into his rule. As it says in Ezra, "the service of Hashem was stopped until the second year of Daryavush king of Persia. On the third year, Nechemya spoke to the king about the broken walls." This was the twentieth year from the reign of the first Koresh, as it says in Megila, it took three years of Koresh, fourteen years of Achashveirosh, and two of Daryavush, since Nechemya asked for its rebuilding in his third year.

However, Tosfos says that we can explain the Pasuk as its simple meaning (that it's twenty years from Daryavush's rule). They started building the Mikdash on the third year and they finished it in his sixth year. However, they haven't built the walls and gates of Yerushalayim, but only the Mikdash. They were living in great peril because non-Jewish marauders would loot them. This went on until the twentieth year of Daryavush that Nechemya asked about the walls of Yerushalayim, as the Pasuk says. However, it didn't mention building the Mikdash, since it was already built.

R' Yosef asked: it says: "on the twenty fourth of the sixth month in the second year of Daryavush." Then it says "on the seventh month, on the twenty first day of the month etc."

Tosfos explains: they're two P'sukim, one after another, in Chagai's prophecy. However, the Pasuk doesn't say explicitly what happened on the twenty fourth of the month in the sixth month. We must say, even though it seems to start its Parsha, it really explained the Parsha beforehand. As it says before, that they started working on the Mikdash. That happened on the twenty fourth of the month in the sixth month. That day they started cutting stone and cutting wood. On the seventh month by the twenty first day, Hashem spoke to Chaggai to command them to be quick and to be dedicated to the work.

If it's true that it starts a new year by Tishrei, it should have said that it was his third year.

R' Avahu answers: Koresh was a decent king; therefore, the Torah counts him like a Jewish king (from Nissan).

R' Yosef asked: first of all, the P'sukim are contradictory. After all, the Pasuk says "and the house was built until the third day of the month of Adar, which was the sixth year of King Daryavush." We learned: at that time by the next year, Ezra went from Bavel with the exiled nation with him. It says "he came to Yerushalayim in the fifth month, which was the seventh year of the king." If it's true (that we count his reign from Nissan, then the Adar of the sixth year should become the seventh year by Nissan, and a year later by Elul) should make it the eighth year.

**Tosfos explains: this is the P'sukim's implication (at that time by the next year, Ezra went from**

Baval). As it says “it built the house in the month of Adar.” Afterwards it says “they made the dedication of the start of using the Mikdash.” Afterwards, they made a Korban Pesach. So, if we count from Nissan, when they made the Pesach it was the seventh year. Afterwards it says “after these happenings in Artchashta reign.” It says “Ezra went up from Bavel.” It’s says “he came to Yerushalayim in the fifth month which was the seventh year of the king.” And it’s written “the first of the month was the start of those who came up from Bavel.” This is almost the same time as before, but a year later. It was near Adar and if we count from Nissan, this would be the eighth year.

Secondly, you’re bringing a proof from Daryavush to Koresh?

The Gemara answers the last question: we learned that Koresh was Daryavush who was Artchashta.

**Tosfos explains that we learn all three from one Pasuk that’s written right before the Pasuk “they finish building this house (Mikdash).” It says “the elders of Judea build and we’re successful with the prophecy Chaggai and Zechrya and his son. With the permission from Hashem and permission from Koresh Daryavush Artchashta the king of Persia.” Then it’s written “they finished the Mikdash on the third of the month of Adar, which was the sixth year of King Daryavush.”**

He was called Koresh since he was a Kosher king (the letters of Koresh and Kosher are the same). He was called Artchashta on account of where he ruled.

**Tosfos explains: even the original Koresh was called Artchashta, as we explained earlier, and it was also on account of those he ruled.**

His real name was Daryavush.

The Gemara asks: but the first question (that the P’sukim are contradictory) is still difficult.

The Gemara answers: we can reconcile; (they only counted him like Jewish kings) before he soured (and became bad). (He was counted like non-Jewish kings) after he soured.