

6 Mar-Cheshvan 5782
Oct. 12, 2021



Rosh Hashanah Daf 3

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

But can I not suppose that New Year is in Iyar?¹ — Do not think such a thing. For it is written: And it came to pass in the first month in the second year on the first day of the month that the Mishkan was erected, and it is written elsewhere: And it came to pass in the second year in the second month . . . that the cloud was taken up front over the Mishkan of the Testimony. Seeing that the text when referring to Nissan places it in the second year and when referring to Iyar places it also in the second year, we may conclude that Iyar is not New Year. Can I suppose then that New Year is in Sivan?² — Do not think such a thing. For it is written: In the third month after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt; and if Sivan is New Year, it should say: ‘In the third month in the second year after the children of Israel etc.’ But why not say that New Year is in Tammuz, in Av, in Adar? — [Rabbi Elozar learns from a different source that kings are counted from the month of Nissan.] Rather, said Rabbi Elozar: It is written in Divrei Hayomim regarding Shlomo Hamelech: “He began to build [the Temple] in the second month, in the second, in the fourth year of his sovereignty.” The words ‘in the second’ are extra. Why are those words repeated? Rabbi Elozar explains it to be referring to the second month from when the king’s reign is counted. [It is evident that the second month of the year, Iyar, is the second month of the king’s year, which starts in Nissan.]

Ravina strongly demurred to this: Why not, [he said], suppose it to mean the second day of the month? — In that case it would have said distinctly, ‘on the second day of the month’. But may I not suppose it means on the second day of the week? [This cannot be for two reasons.] One is that we never find the second day of the week mentioned in Scripture, and the other is that the second ‘sheini’ [second] is put on the same footing as the first sheini, [indicating that] just as the first sheini refers to a month, so the second sheini refers to a month.

It has been taught in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan: How do we know [from the Scripture] that the years of kings’ reigns are always reckoned as commencing from Nissan? Because it says: And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt etc., and it is further written: And Aaron the Kohen went up to Hor HaHor at the commandment of Hashem, etc., and it is further written: And it came to pass in the fortieth year in the eleventh month, and it is further written: After he had smitten Sichon etc., and it is further written: And all the congregation saw that Aaron had perished etc., and it is further written: And it came to pass in the first month in the second year etc., and it is further written: And it came to pass in the second year in the second month etc., and it is further written: In the third month after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt etc.,

¹ The second month – after Nissan.

² The third month.

and it is further written: And he began to build etc. (3a1 – 3a2)

JEWISH KINGS – NISSAN

GENTILE KINGS - TISHREI

Rav Chisda qualifies the ruling of the Mishnah and states that our Mishnah's ruling that Nissan is the New Year for kings is only referring to Jewish Kings, however in regards to gentile kings, we count from Tishrei. This is proven from two verses in Nechemiah. The first verse states: The words of Nechemiah the son of Chachaliah: It came to pass in the month of Kislev, in the twentieth year.³ It is further written: In the month of Nissan, in the twentieth year of Artachshasta (a Persian king).⁴ Since the first event took place in Kislev and the second in Nissan and they are both described as taking place in the twentieth year of Artachshasta, it is obvious that there was not a New Year between them. [This proves that the New Year for gentile kings cannot be in Nissan and thus we assume that the New Year for them is Tishrei.] [This, however, is not conclusive]. In the latter text, it is true, it is expressly stated that [it was the twentieth year] of Artachshasta, but in the former how do we know that the reign of Artachshasta referred to? Perhaps some other system of dating is adopted? — Rav Ppapa replied: The occurrence in each text of the expression 'twentieth year' provides us with a *gezeirah shavah*, [indicating that] just as in the latter case it means 'of the reign of Artachshasta, so in the former. But how do you know that the incident of Kislev was prior? Perhaps the incident of Nissan was prior?⁵ — Do not think such a thing,⁶ since it has been taught: The

things that Chanani told Nechemiah in Kislev were related by Nechemiah to the king in Nissan. 'The things that Chanani told Nechemiah', as we read: The words of Nechemiah the son of Chachaliah. Now it came to pass in the month of Kislev, in the twentieth year, as I was in Shushan the Capital, that Chanani, one of my brethren, came out of Judah, he and certain men; and I asked them concerning the Jews that had escaped, that were left of the captivity, and concerning Jerusalem. And they said to me: The remnant that are left of the captivity there in the province are in great affliction and reproach; the wall of Jerusalem also is broken down, and its gates are burned with fire. These things 'were related by Nechemiah to the king in Nissan,' as we read: And it came to pass in the month Nissan, in the twentieth year of Artachshasta the king, when wine was before him, that I took up the wine and gave it to the king. Now I had not appeared downcast in his presence. And the king said to me: Why is your face downcast, seeing you are not sick? This is nothing else but sorrow of heart. Then I was very much afraid. And I said to the king: Let the king live forever; why shouldn't my face be downcast, when the city, the place of my ancestors' graves, lie in ruins and its gates are consumed with fire? Then the king said to me: For what do you request? So I prayed to the God of Heaven, and I said to the king: If it please the king and if your servant has found favor in your sight, that you would send me to Judah, to the city of my ancestors' graves, that I may build it. And the king said to me, with the queen also sitting by him: For how long will your journey be and when will you return? So it pleased the king to send me; and I set him a time. (3a2 – 3b1)

³ Nechemiah was notified of the pathetic condition of the Jews residing in Yerushalayim.

⁴ Nechemiah requested permission from the king to build the walls of Yerushalayim.

⁵ The Gemora questions the proof: How do we know that the Kislev event preceded the incident that happened in Nissan? Perhaps the

Nissan incident occurred prior to the Kislev event, thereby explaining why they are both described as happening in Artachshasta's twentieth year and Nissan can still be considered the New Year for gentile kings?

⁶ This question is answered by citing a Baraisa which states explicitly that the matters that were told to Nechemiah in Kislev were repeated by Nechemiah to the king in Nissan.

Rav Yosef challenged Rav Chisda's ruling from the verses in Chagai. It is written that the people resumed construction of the Beis Hamikdash on the twenty-fourth day of the month, in the sixth month, in the second year of Daryavesh. In the next verse, it states that in the seventh month on the twenty-first day of the month, Hashem told Chagai that the splendor of this Beis Hamikdash will be greater than that of the first one. According to Rav Chisda, the second verse should have stated "In the seventh month of the third year" since the seventh month is Tishrei and Tishrei is the beginning of the New Year for gentile kings.

Rabbi Avahu answers that Koresh was a righteous king and therefore his reign was calculated from Nissan as they would do for the Jewish kings.

Rav Yosef demurred strongly against this [last notion]. For one thing [he said, if this is so,] then there is a contradiction between two verses, for it is written: And the Temple was finished on the third day of the month of Adar, which was the sixth year of Daryavesh the king, and in connection with this it has been taught: At that period, in the year following, Ezra went up from Babylon along with his band of exiles. Now it is written further: And he [Ezra] came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king; and if it is [as you say], it should be 'in the eighth year'? Further, is there any connection [between your answer and the question]? You speak of Koresh and the text speaks of Daryavesh! — It has been taught: Koresh, Daryavesh, and Artachshasta were all one. He was called Koresh because he was a worthy king; Artachshasta after his realm; while Daryavesh was his own name. All the same, the contradiction still remains? — Rabbi Yitzchak said: There is no

contradiction. The one verse speaks of him before he soured, the other after he soured.

Rav Kahana strongly demurred to this [saying]: Did he indeed sour? Is it not written: And that which they have need of, both young bulls and rams and lambs, for olah-offerings to the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine and oil, according to the word of the Kohanim that are in Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail? — Rabbi Yitzchak said to him: My teacher! From your own package! That they may offer sacrifices of sweet savor to the God of Heaven, and pray for the life of the king and of his sons. But even so, isn't the action still a meritorious one, seeing that it has been taught: If a man says, "I offer this sela for charity in order that my children may live and in order that through it I may merit the future world," he may still be a wholly righteous man? — There is no contradiction; this statement applies to Jews, there we speak of idolaters. (3b1 – 4a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

WAS KORESH A JEW?

Rabbi Avahu explained that Koresh was a righteous king and therefore his reign was calculated from Nissan as they would do for the Jewish kings.

It is evident from this Gemora that Koresh was a gentile.

Tosfos comments that Koresh was the son of Esther. This can be found in several Medrashim.

The question is obvious that if Koresh is the son of Esther, he is not a gentile but rather a Jew. The Gemora in Yevamos (45b) rules that a gentile that lives with a Jewish woman and has a child, the child is indeed



Jewish. The Rambam in Hilchos Issurei Biah (15:3) rules according to this Gemora as well. Why does our Gemora state that he was a righteous gentile and that is the reason his years were calculated from Nissan? The Gemora could have answered that Koresh was a Jew and that is why his years are counted from Nissan?

Rashi's opinion is that a gentile that lives with a Jewish woman and has a child, that child is a gentile and the meaning of the Gemora that states that he is kosher means that he is not considered illegitimate. If the child would be a Jew, he must be considered illegitimate since he is the product of two people that cannot be married to each other.

Rav Elyashiv Shlita answers that in the times of Koresh the ruling was that the child is a gentile and that is why the Gemora inquired as to why the counting of his years was from Nissan. It was only afterwards that the ruling was established that the child is considered a Jew.

This would be similar to the ruling in the times of Boaz. Until the time of Boaz, it was ruled that one is not permitted to marry an Amonis woman. This is why Ploni Almoni refused to marry Rus. It was only after Boaz ruled that she was permitted that the halachah was established for the future that an Amonis is indeed permitted.

MENTIONING SHABBOS DURING THE WEEK

Rabbi Elozar learns from a different source that kings are counted from the month of Nissan. It is written in Divrei Hayomim regarding Shlomo Hamelech "He began to build in the second month, in the second, in the fourth year of his sovereignty." The words 'in the second' are extra. Why are those words repeated? Rabbi Elozar explains it to be referring to the second

month from when the king's reign is counted. It is evident that the second month of the year, Iyar is the second month of the king's year, which starts in Nissan.

The Gemora explains that the extra words 'in the second' cannot be referring to the second day of the week since we do not find such a term written in the Torah.

Tosfos cites from a Yerushalmi that the verse in Breishis "There was evening, there was morning, a second day" is not referring to the day of the week but rather to the second day of Creation.

Sfas Emes asks from several verses in Parshas B'shalach that state that the manna fell on the sixth day. He answers that perhaps our Gemora was only referring to the second day but other days of the week are mentioned in the Torah.

The Ramban in Parshas Bo points out that other nations assign intrinsic names to the days of week (such as Sunday, Monday . . . or dimanche, lundi . . .) whereas we denominate every day relative to Shabbos (yom rishon, - "first day" - yom sheni - "second day . . . B'Shabbos). This is a fulfillment of the mitzvah "Remember the Shabbos day to sanctify it." This is similar to the custom of Shamai who would eat every day in honor of Shabbos. When he would find a better-quality animal, he would say that this should be set aside for Shabbos. This is why we mention every day in the 'song of the day' that today is the first day from Shabbos.

Rav Yeruchem Fishel Perlow in his classic commentary on Rabbeinu Sadya Gaon writes that it is apparent from our Gemora not like the Ramban since the Gemora states unequivocally that we do not find the term

‘second day of the week in the Torah.’ The Yerushalmi adds that this calculation is not found in the Torah. According to the Ramban that it’s a mitzvah to mention the days of the week in this manner, why don’t we find the names of the days mentioned in this manner in the Torah?

Rav Nosson Grossman in his sefer Poseach Shaar offers a novel approach to explain the Ramban and our Gemora. There is a mitzvah to count the days of the week relative to Shabbos providing that this will bring about sanctity for this Shabbos or the Shabbos in the future. One who relates that a certain incident occurred on the second day since Shabbos does not sanctify the Shabbos at all. The custom of Shamai to designate an animal for this Shabbos, stating in the ‘song of the day’ that today is the second day of the Shabbos and writing in a divorce contract the day relative to Shabbos are all sanctifying this Shabbos and one fulfills the mitzvah of “Remember the Shabbos day to sanctify it.”

I found the following discussion in the Hearos blog on the daf related to our issue: When we refer to the day of the week as "rishon b'Shabbos, sheini b'Shabbos".... Does it mean: 1. Day one **from** Shabbos. 2. Day one **to** Shabbos 3. Day one of the week?

The Beis Shmuel (Even Haezer 126:7) says that in Gittin we should write "b'Shabbos" and not "l'Shabbos" because the language "l'Shabbos" implies from Shabbos including Shabbos. Therefore, "l'Shabbos" would imply Shabbos is day 1, Sunday is day 2, Monday is day 3 etc. But now that we say "b'Shabbos" the problem is solved. Although I can't prove it, it seems to me that "b'Shabbos" also implies that we are counting **from** Shabbos, just that the language "b'Shabbos" indicates that Shabbos is not included in the number so that "sheini b'Shabbos" would correctly refer to Monday.

Just as "l'Shabbos" is clearly counting from Shabbos, so too "b'Shabbos" is counting from Shabbos without including Shabbos in the count.

It would seem to me that according to the Poseach Shaar, this would not be the case. There is no mitzvah to mention that today is the second day since Shabbos. That is ancient history. The point of mentioning Shabbos is to sanctify the present Shabbos or the future Shabbos. Therefore, the meaning of “rishon b’Shabbos” is today is the first day of the week leading up to the upcoming Shabbos.

DAILY MASHAL

Tosfos quotes a Medrash that states that the king of Arad was actually Amalek. The Yalkut adds that they dressed and spoke like the Canaanites. Amalek changed their language to speak in the Canaanite tongue, so that the Jews would pray to their G-d to give the Canaanites into their hands, but they were not Canaanites. When they came close to the Jews, it was apparent by their faces that they were from Amalek.

Reb Chaim Volozin was once walking in the streets of Peterburg. A young gentile approached him and gave him a beating. Reb Chaim was very interested to discover the name of this gentile lad. He found out that this was Alexander, the son of Czar Nikolai.

Reb Chaim was asked as to why he was so curious to learn the name of the boy. Reb Chaim responded that his Rebbe, the Vilna Gaon, had given over to him the signs of recognizing who is a descendant of Amalek. Reb Chaim said that he noticed all the symbols on the face of that ‘sheiget.’