

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 2a

CHAPTER I

MISHNAH. THERE ARE FOUR NEW YEARS.¹ ON THE FIRST OF NISAN² IS NEW YEAR FOR KINGS³ AND FOR FESTIVALS.⁴ ON THE FIRST OF ELUL⁵ IS NEW YEAR FOR THE TITHE OF CATTLE.⁶ R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON, HOWEVER, PLACE THIS ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI.⁷ ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI⁸ IS NEW YEAR FOR YEARS,⁴ FOR RELEASE AND JUBILEE YEARS,⁹ FOR PLANTATION¹⁰ AND FOR [TITHE OF] VEGETABLES.¹¹ ON THE FIRST OF SHEBAT¹² IS NEW YEAR FOR TREES,¹³ ACCORDING TO THE RULING OF BETH SHAMMAI; BETH HILLEL, HOWEVER, PLACE IT ON THE FIFTEENTH OF THAT MONTH.

GEMARA. FOR KINGS. Why this law?¹⁴ — R. Hisda said: For dealing with documents,¹⁵ as we have learnt: 'Bonds if antedated are invalid,¹⁶ but if postdated are valid'.

Our Rabbis learnt: If a king ascended the throne on the twenty-ninth of Adar, as soon as the first of Nisan arrives¹⁷ he is reckoned to have reigned a year. If on the other hand he ascended the throne on the first of Nisan, he is not reckoned to have reigned a year till the next first of Nisan comes round.

The Master has said, 'If a king ascends the throne on the twenty-ninth of Adar, as soon as the first of Nisan arrives he is reckoned to have reigned a year.'

(1) I.e., the year is reckoned to commence at different dates for different purposes, as the Mishnah goes on to specify.

(2) The first month of the Jewish calendar (in Biblical times known as 'the month of Abib', or the springing corn), commencing in the latter half of March or the earlier part of April.

(3) If a document is dated with a certain year in a king's reign, the year is reckoned to have commenced in Nisan, no matter in what month the king came to the throne. The Gemara discusses what kinds of kings are meant — whether Israelitish or other.

(4) The meaning of this is discussed infra in the Gemara.

(5) The sixth month of the Jewish calendar.

(6) For purposes of tithe it was necessary to specify the year in which cattle were born, because cattle born in one year could not be given as tithe for cattle born in another, v. Lev. XXVII, 32.

(7) So that according to these authorities there were only three New Years.

(8) The seventh month.

(9) I.e., from the first of Tishri in these years ploughing and similar operations were forbidden. V. Lev. XXV, 4, 11.

(10) For reckoning the years of 'uncircumcision'. V. Lev. XIX, 23.

(11) I.e., those gathered after this date could not be used as tithe for those gathered before. Cf. n. 6.

(12) The eleventh month.

(13) For tithing the fruit. V. notes 6 and 11.

(14) Why should we not be content to reckon the year of the king from the day on which he ascended the throne?

(15) I.e., to enable us to determine which are antedated.

(16) If a man borrowed money in Tishri and the bond was dated in Tammuz (the fourth month of the Jewish calendar) the bond is invalid and does not give the lender any right to seize property which the borrower may have sold even subsequent to Tishri. This is a fine for having conspired to seize by means of the bond property which had been sold prior to the making of the loan. Now if the reigning king came to the throne some time between Tammuz and Tishri, then if we reckoned his years from the date of his accession, Tishri would always come before Tammuz, and the document should therefore be valid. To prevent this leading to confusion, it was consequently ordained that the king's year should always be regarded as commencing with Nisan. Tosaf. point out that it is very difficult to conceive of an instance where this might actually lead to confusion, as scribes can usually be trusted to remember the year of the reign; the example Tosaf. give is where the king came to the throne on the first of Nisan and a scribe has to write a document

on the first of Nisan in the following year. In such a case the scribe might easily think that the king came to the throne on the second of Nisan, and so, but for the regulation, might date the document a whole year wrong.

(17) I.e., on the next day.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 2b

This teaches us that Nisan is the New Year for kings, and that one day in a year is reckoned as a year. 'But if he ascended the throne on the first of Nisan he is not reckoned to have reigned a year till the next first of Nisan comes round'. This surely is self-evident? — It had to be stated in view of the case where his election to the throne was determined upon¹ in Adar. You might think that in that case we should reckon him [by the next first of Nisan] to have reigned two years. We are therefore told [that this is not so].

Our Rabbis learnt: If [a king] died in Adar and was succeeded by another in Adar, we can designate [the rest of] the year [up to the first of Nisan] as belonging to either.² If he died in Nisan and was succeeded by another in Nisan, we can date the year by either.³ If he died in Adar and was succeeded by another in Nisan, the earlier year is dated by the first and the later by the second.

The Master has here said, 'If he died in Adar and was succeeded by another, we can date the year by either'. Surely this is obvious? — You might think that we never date the same year by two kings;⁴ hence we are told [that this can be done]. 'If the first died in Nisan and was succeeded by another in Nisan, the year may be dated by either'. This also seems to be obvious? — You might think that when we lay down that a day in the year is reckoned as a year we mean only at the end of the year but not at the beginning;⁵ therefore we are told [that this is not so]. 'If the first died in Adar and he was succeeded by another in Nisan, the earlier year is dated by the first and the later by the second'. This surely is obvious? — It had to be stated in view of the case where his election was determined upon from Adar and he is succeeding his father.⁶ In that case you might think that we should reckon two years to him. We are therefore told [that this is not so].

R. Johanan said: How do we know [from the Scripture] that the years of kings' reigns are always reckoned as commencing from Nisan? Because it says, And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Ziv which is the second month.⁷ Here Solomon's reign is put side by side with the exodus from Egypt,⁸ [to indicate that] just as [the years from] the exodus from Egypt are reckoned from Nisan, so [the years of] Solomon's reign commenced with Nisan.

But how do we know that the years from the exodus from Egypt itself are reckoned as commencing with Nisan? Perhaps we reckon them from Tishri?⁹ — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written, And Aaron the priest went up into Mount Hor at the commandment of the Lord, and died there, in the fortieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fifth month,¹⁰ on the first day of the month,¹¹ and it is further written, And it came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month,¹² on the first day of the month, that Moses spoke, etc.¹³ Now since the text when referring to Ab places it in the fortieth year and again when referring to [the following] Shebat places it also in the fortieth year, we may conclude that Tishri is not the beginning of the year.¹⁴ [This, however] is not conclusive. I grant you that the former text states explicitly that [the year spoken of was] 'from the going forth from Egypt'; but how do we know that [the year mentioned in] the latter text is reckoned from the exodus?¹⁵ Perhaps it is from the setting up of the Tabernacle?¹⁶ — [We may reply to this] on the model of R. Papa, who said [in another connection]¹⁷ that the occurrence of the expression 'twentieth year' in two contexts provides us with a gezerah shawah:¹⁸ so here, [I may say that the occurrence of] the expression 'fortieth year' in the two contexts provides us with a gezerah shawah, [showing that] just as in the one case¹⁹ [the date is reckoned] from the Exodus, so in the other case²⁰ also.

But how do you know that [in respect of these two incidents] that of Ab was prior? Perhaps that of Shebat was prior?²¹ — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written [in connection with the latter], ‘After he had smitten Sihon’;²² and when Aaron died Sihon was still alive, as it is written

-
- (1) By the notables of the State. Lit. ‘they (i.e., their votes) have been counted for him’.
 - (2) I.e., we can regard the remaining days of the year as belonging either to the last year of the late king or the first year of the new king.
 - (3) And similarly if the second ascended the throne in any other month of the year.
 - (4) But reckon the whole as belonging to the one who has died.
 - (5) E.g., if the first king died after only reigning a few days in the year.
 - (6) This point is mentioned here because we have already been told above that his mere election does not affect the dating.
 - (7) I Kings. VI. 1.
 - (8) I.e., the event recorded is dated by both of them.
 - (9) Which is the beginning of years reckoned from the creation.
 - (10) Ab.
 - (11) Num. XXXIII, 38.
 - (12) Shebat.
 - (13) Deut. I, 3.
 - (14) As otherwise Ab and Shebat would fall in different years.
 - (15) As it simply says ‘In the fortieth year’, without specifying from when.
 - (16) Which was in Nisan of the second year of the exodus.
 - (17) V. infra 3b.
 - (18) V. Glos.
 - (19) The death of Aaron.
 - (20) The address of Moses.
 - (21) I.e., the address of Moses was prior to the death of Aaron, the fortieth year having commenced with the Tishri preceding Moses’ address.
 - (22) Deut. I, 4.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 3a

And the Canaanite the king of Arad heard.¹ What was the report that he heard? He heard that Aaron had died and that the clouds of glory had departed, and he judged that it was now permitted to attack Israel; and this is intimated in the verse, And all the congregation saw [wa-yirur] that Aaron was dead,² [commenting on which] R. Abbahu said, Do not read wayirur, but wa-yerau [and they were seen],³ [the next word⁴ being translated] in accordance with the dictum of Resh Lakish; for Resh Lakish said, Ki has four significations — ‘if’, ‘perhaps’, ‘but’ ‘for’.⁵ [In objection to this it may be asked], Are the two things alike?⁶ [The verse] there speaks of Canaan, whereas [here] it [speaks of] Sihon? — It has been taught: Sihon, Arad, and Canaan are all one. He was called Sihon as resembling a sayyah [foal] of the wilderness, he was called Canaan after his kingdom; and as for his real name, this was Arad. According to other authorities, he was called Arad as resembling an ‘arad [wild ass] of the wilderness, and Canaan after his kingdom, while as for his real name, this was Sihon.

But can I not suppose that New Year is in Iyar?⁷ — Do not imagine 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 tabernacle was reared up,⁸ 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 tabernacle of the testimony.⁹ Seeing that the text when referring to Nisan 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?¹⁰ — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written, In the third month after the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt;¹¹ 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,¹² in Ab,¹³ in Adar?¹⁴ — Rather, said R. Eleazar, we learn [that Nisan is New Year] from here: And he began to build in the second month in the second¹⁵ in the fourth year of his reign.¹⁶ What [is here meant by] ‘in the second’? Does not [the superfluous word] mean the second by which his reign is reckoned? Rabina 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’.¹⁷ 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 ‘sheni’ [second] is put on the same footing as the first sheni, [indicating that] just as the first sheni refers to a month, so the second sheni refers to a month.

It has been taught in accordance with R. Johanan: How do we know [from the Scripture] that the years of kings’ reigns are always reckoned as commencing from Nisan? Because it says, ‘And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt etc.’ and it is further written, ‘And Aaron the priest went up to Mount Hor at the commandment of the Lord, etc.’ and it is further written, And it came to pass in the fortieth year in the eleventh month’,¹⁸ and it is further written, ‘After he had smitten Sihon etc.’ and it is further written, And all the congregation saw that Aaron was dead 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 were gone forth out of the land of Egypt etc.’ and it is further written, ‘And he began to build etc.’

R. Hisda said: The rule [that New Year for kings is in Nisan] was only meant to apply to the kings of Israel, but the years of non-Israelitish kings are reckoned from Tishri,¹⁹ as it says, The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah. Now it came to pass in the month of Kislev,²⁰ in the twentieth year²¹ etc., and it is written further, And it came to pass in the month of Nisan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes.²² Now since when speaking of Kislev he places it in the twentieth year and when speaking of Nisan he places it also in the twentieth, we may conclude that New Year is not in Nisan. [This, however, is not conclusive]. In the latter text, it is true, it is expressly stated that [it was the twentieth year] of Artaxerxes, but in the former how do we know that the reign of Artaxerxes is referred to? Perhaps

(1) Num. XXXIII, 40. (V. Tosaf. s.v. **יִשְׁמַע**). The text continues in the E.V., of the coming of the children of Israel, but the Talmud renders (more in accordance with the original), ‘when the children of Israel came’. The text thus does not state what he heard and so leaves room for the exposition which follows.

(2) Num. XX, 29.

(3) I.e., became visible, the clouds of glory having previously served as a screen to them.

(4) In the original.

(5) And here if we read wa-yerau, ‘ki’ means ‘for’. Apparently Resh Lakish means that these four significations are in addition to the usual one of ‘that’, which must be the meaning here if we keep the reading wa-yiru.

(6) Viz., your exposition and your argument.

(7) The second month.

(8) Ex. XL, 17.

(9) Num., X, 11.

(10) The third month.

(11) Ex. XIX, 1.

(12) The fourth month.

(13) The fifth month.

(14) The twelfth month. The months between Ab and Adar have already been excluded above where it was shown that

Ab and Shebat must be in the same year.

(15) E.V., 'on the second day'.

(16) II Chron. III, 2.

(17) This being the usual formula of the text.

(18) This citation is inserted in the text on the authority of Maharsha. It is certainly necessary.

(19) The seventh month.

(20) The ninth month.

(21) Neh., I, 1.

(22) Ibid, II, 1.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 3b

some other system of dating is adopted? — R. Papa replied: The occurrence in each text of the expression 'twentieth year' provides us with a *gezerah shawah*,¹ [indicating that] just as in the latter case it means 'of the reign of Artaxerxes', so in the former. But how do you know that the incident of Kislev was prior? Perhaps the incident of Nisan was prior?² — Do not imagine such a thing, since it has been taught: The things that Hanani told Nehemiah in Kislev were related by Nehemiah to the king in Nisan. 'The things that Hanani told Nehemiah', as we read, The words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah. Now it came to pass in the month of Kislev, in the twentieth year, as I was in Shushan the castle, that Hanani, 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 unto 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 the gates thereof are burned with fire.³ These things 'were related by Nehemiah to the king in Nisan,' as we read, And it came to pass in the month Nisan, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king, when wine was before him, that I took up the wine and gave it unto the king. Now I had not been beforetimes sad in his presence. And the king said unto me, Why is thy countenance sad, seeing thou art not sick? This is nothing else but sorrow of heart. Then I was very sore afraid. And I said unto the king, Let the king live for ever; why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste and the gates thereof are consumed with fire? Then the king said to me: For what dost thou make request? So I prayed to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king: If it please the king and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldst send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchres, that I may build it. And the king said unto me, the queen also sitting by him, For how long will thy journey be and when wilt thou return? So it pleased the king to send me; and I set him a time.⁴

R. Joseph sought to disprove [the statement that the years of non-Israelitish kings are reckoned from Tishri, as follows]: [It is written], In the four and twentieth day of the month, in the sixth month, in the second year of Darius the king,⁵ and it is further written, In the seventh month in the second year in the one and twentieth day of the month.⁶ Now if it is [as you say], then we should have here 'in the seventh month in the third year'! — R. Abbahu replied: Cyrus was a worthy king,⁷ and therefore they reckoned his years like those of the kings of Israel.⁸

R. Joseph demurred strongly against this [last notion]. For one thing [he said, if this is so,] then there is a contradiction between two biblical texts. For it is written, And the house⁹ was finished on the third day of the month of Adar, which was the sixth year of Darius the king,¹⁰ and in connection with this it has been taught: 'At that period, in the year following,¹¹ 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 Cyrus and the text¹² speaks of Darius! — It has been taught: 'Cyrus,¹³ Darius, and Artaxerxes¹⁴ were all one. He was called Cyrus because he was a worthy king;¹⁵ Artaxerxes after his realm;¹⁶ while Darius

was his own name. All the same, the contradiction still remains?¹⁷ — There is no contradiction. The one verse¹⁸ speaks of him before he degenerated,¹⁹ the other after he degenerated.

R. Kahana strongly demurred to this [saying], Did he indeed degenerate? Is it not written,

(1) V. Glos.

(2) And the year might therefore commence with Nisan.

(3) Neh., I, 1-3.

(4) Neh. II, 1-6. It is not clear why the last three verses are quoted.

(5) Hag. I, 15.

(6) Ibid. II, 1. This verse follows immediately on the one just quoted and it is assumed that it refers to the same year as the preceding verse; therefore the words 'in the second year', which appear in the quotation as given in the Talmud in brackets, are not found in this verse (Rashi).

(7) The Hebrew word is kasher, which contains the same consonants as the name Koresh (Cyrus).

(8) I.e., commenced them with Nisan.

(9) The Second Temple.

(10) Ezra, VI, 15.

(11) Which would be the seventh year of Darius.

(12) In Haggai.

(13) The Second.

(14) Mentioned together in Ezra, VI, 14.

(15) V. supra, p. 8, n. 4.

(16) [The Persian Artakhshathra means 'by whom empire is perfected'].

(17) Between the statements in Haggai and in Ezra.

(18) In Haggai, which reckons his years from Nisan.

(19) Lit., 'fermented', a metaphor either from wine turning to vinegar or from flour becoming leaven. The 'evil imagination' is often compared by the Sages to a 'leaven'.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 4a

And that which they have need of, both young bullocks and rams and lambs, for burnt-offerings to the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine and oil, according to the word of the priests that are in Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail?¹ — Said R. Isaac to him: [Here is something] out of your own package:² That they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and of his sons.³ But even so, is not 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 Israelites, there we speak of heathens.⁴

Alternatively I may say that we know he deteriorated because it is written, with three rows of great stones and a row of new timber, and let the expenses be given out of the king's house.⁵ Why did he make these conditions? He thought to himself, If the Jews revolt against me, I will burn it with fire. But did not Solomon do the same thing, as it is written, three rows of hewn stone and a row of cedar beams?⁶ — Solomon placed the wood above and he placed it below; Solomon sunk it in the building and he did not sink it in the building; Solomon plastered it over and he did not plaster it over.

R. Joseph, (or, as some say, R. Isaac) said: Whence do we know that he deteriorated? From here: And the king said unto me, the shegal also sitting by hint.⁷ What is 'shegal'? Rabbah b. Lema said In the name of Rab, a she-dog.⁸ But if that is so, what are we to make of the verse, But hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven, and they have brought the vessels of His house before thee, and

thou and thy lords, thy shegaloth and thy concubines have drunk wine in them.⁹ Now how can 'shegal' here be a dog? Do dogs drink wine? — This is no difficulty, as [we can suppose that] it was taught to drink. But what of the verse where it is written, Kings' daughters are among thy favourites, at thy right hand doth stand the shegal in gold of Ophir?¹⁰ Now if 'shegal' is a dog, what promise is the prophet bringing to Israel? — What he means is this: Because the Torah is as dear to Israel as a 'shegal' to the heathens, you have earned as your reward the gold of Ophir. Alternatively I may say that 'shegal' does as a rule mean 'queen', but in this case Rabbah b. Lema had a tradition [that it means 'dog'], and the reason why [in the text] it is called 'shegal' is because it was as dear to him¹¹ as a queen; or, possibly, because he put it on the queen's seat.

Alternatively I may say that we know he deteriorated from here: Unto a hundred talents of silver and to a hundred measures of wheat and to a hundred baths of wine and salt without prescribing how much.¹² At first there was no limit, but now he made a limit. But perhaps at first he simply had not decided on the limit? The truth is that the best explanation is that which was given first.

AND FOR FESTIVALS. How can [New Year] for the festivals be on the first of Nisan? It is surely on the fifteenth of Nisan?¹³ — R. Hisda said: What it means is that the festival which occurs in it is the New Year for the festivals. The legal import of this rule is for determining when one who makes a vow transgresses the precept of 'not delaying'.¹⁴ and R. Simeon is here followed, as it has been taught: Whether a man makes a vow, or sanctifies,¹⁵ or makes a valuation,¹⁶ as soon as three festivals elapse [before he carries out his word], he transgresses the precept of 'not delaying'. R. Simeon says: The three festivals must be in order, with Passover first. So too R. Simeon b. Yohai used to say: The festivals [referred to] are sometimes three [in number], sometimes four, sometimes five. For instance, if a man made a vow before Passover, they are three, if before Pentecost five, if before Tabernacles four.

Our Rabbis taught: Those who are liable for a money valuation,¹⁷ for a valuation,¹⁸ for a herem,¹⁹ for consecrations,²⁰ for sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, charity contributions, tithes, firstborn and tithe of cattle, paschal lamb,

(1) Ezra, VI, 9.

(2) I.e., the next words in the same passage confute you.

(3) Which would show that his motives were not pure.

(4) And therefore the king's action was not meritorious. [Heathens are assumed to regret the good deed should the attached condition not be realized (Rashi and Tosaf.)].

(5) Ezra, VI, 4. These words occur in the rescript issued by the first Cyrus authorizing the building of the Temple. We must suppose therefore that Darius intended at first to allow them to build it wholly of stone, but on consulting the rescript changed his mind. V. Tosaf. s.v. **וַנְדַבֵּר**

(6) I Kings, VI, 36.

(7) Neh. II, 6.

(8) For immoral purposes.

(9) Dan. V, 23.

(10) Ps. XLV, 10.

(11) Artaxerxes.

(12) Ezra VII, 22, referring to the appropriations for the builders of the Temple.

(13) The first day of Passover, the first of the festivals.

(14) Deut. XXIII, 22: When thou shalt vow a vow to the Lord thy God, thou shalt not delay to pay it.

(15) I.e., dedicates an object to the Sanctuary.

(16) Saying, 'I dedicate to the sanctuary the value of such-and-such a person'. V. Lev. XXVII, 1-8.

(17) By saying, 'I dedicate to the Sanctuary my own price'.

(18) V. supra, n. 4.

(19) Something devoted. V. Lev. XXVII, 28, 29.

(20) Objects dedicated to the Sanctuary.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 4b

gleanings, forgotten sheaves and corners of the field,¹ as soon as three festivals have elapsed transgress the precept of 'not delaying'. R. Simeon said: The three festivals must be in order, with Passover first. R. Meir said: As soon as one festival has passed, he transgresses the precept of 'not delaying'. R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: As soon as two festivals have elapsed, he transgresses the precept of 'not delaying'. R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon said: As soon as the feast of Tabernacles has passed, he transgresses the precept of 'not delaying'.

What is the reason of the First Tanna?² — Let us see, [he says]: The text³ has been speaking of them⁴ [the three festivals]. Why then does it repeat,⁵ on the feast of unleavened bread, on the feast of weeks, and on the feast of tabernacles? We must understand it to be laying down the rule for 'not delaying'.⁶ R. Simeon again says that there was no need [even so] to repeat 'on the feast of tabernacles', of which the text was just speaking.⁷ Why then was it mentioned? To show that this one must be the last. What is R. Meir's reason?⁸ — Because it is written, And thither thou shalt come and thither ye shall bring.⁹ What do the Rabbis [say to this]? — They say that this constitutes only a positive injunction.¹⁰ What has R. Meir [to say to this]? — [He says that] since the All-Merciful told him to bring and he did not bring, automatically he has transgressed the precept of 'not delaying'. What is the reason of R. Eliezer b. Jacob?¹¹ Because it is written, These ye shall offer unto the Lord in your appointed seasons;¹² the minimum of 'seasons' is two. What do the Rabbis [say to this]? — [They say] that this word is required for the exposition of R. Jonah; for R. Jonah said,¹³ All the festivals are put on the same footing with one another, to show that all¹⁴ atone for the uncleanness of the Sanctuary and its holy things.¹⁵ What is the reason of R. Eleazar son of Simeon?¹⁶ As it has been taught: R. Eleazar son of Simeon said: There was no need for the feast of Tabernacles to be mentioned in this verse,¹⁷ as the text was already speaking of it. Why then was it mentioned? To show that this one is the determining factor. What exposition then do R. Meir and R. Eliezer b. Jacob give of the words 'on the feast of unleavened bread and on the feast of weeks and on the feast of tabernacles'? — They require them for the same purpose as R. Eleazar b. Oshaia. For R. Eleazar b. Oshaia said: How do we know that [a sacrifice due but not brought on] Pentecost¹⁸ can be made up for during the next seven days? Because it says, On the feast of unleavened bread and on the feast of weeks and on the feast of tabernacles. Just as [a sacrifice not brought on the first day of] the feast of Passover can be made up for during the next seven days,¹⁹ so [a sacrifice not brought on] the Feast of Weeks can be made up for during the next seven days.

But why should not the Feast of Weeks be put on the same footing [in this respect] as the feast of Tabernacles, so that just as in that case [the duration of the festival is] eight days, so here eight days [should be allowed]? — The eighth day [of Tabernacles] is a separate festival.²⁰ I can still say that we call the eighth day a separate festival in respect of P'Z'R' K'SH'B',²¹ but that in the matter of compensation all agree that this can be made on it for the first day, as we have learnt: If one did not bring his festival sacrifice on the first day of Tabernacles, he can bring during the whole of the festival, including the last day of the festival? — If you grasp a lot you cannot hold it, if you grasp a little you can hold it.²²

But what injunction then²³ did the All-Merciful indicate by mentioning the festival of Tabernacles [in this verse]? — [It is mentioned] in order to be put on the same footing as the feast of Passover [in this respect]:

(1) If an owner took these, he has to restore them to the poor.

(2) Who requires three festivals in any order.

(3) Viz., Deut. XVI.

- (4) Lit. he set out from these’.
- (5) In v. 16, after saying, three times a year shall all thy males appear, etc.
- (6) As much as to say, ‘Come before God to pay your vows, and do not come empty-handed.’
- (7) In vv. 13-15.
- (8) For requiring only one festival.
- (9) Deut. XII, 5, 6. As much as to say, ‘each time you come, bring your vows’.
- (10) And if he does not carry it out, he is still not guilty of ‘delaying’.
- (11) Who requires two festivals.
- (12) Num. XXIX, 39. The ‘these’ here strictly refers to obligatory sacrifices, but as the text goes on, besides your vows and free will-offerings, these can also be included in the rule.
- (13) Sheb. 10.
- (14) The he-goats for sin-offering brought on festivals; v. Num. XXVIII and XXIX.
- (15) V. Shebu. 10a.
- (16) Who says that Tabernacles must be the last,
- (17) Viz., Deut. XVI, 16.
- (18) ‘Azereth.
- (19) This is learnt from the words, And ye shall keep it as a feast to the Lord . . . seven days (Ex. XII, 14, 15). V. Hag. 9a.
- (20) Standing in the same relation to Tabernacles as Pentecost to Passover.
- (21) P== payyes (casting lots); on the eighth day the twenty-four mishmaroth (wards) of the priests cast lots to see which should officiate, but not on the preceding days, when all officiated in order. Z == zeman (time); the blessing sheheheyanu (who has kept us alive) is said on the eighth day, as on the first days of other festivals. R == regel (festival); the eighth day is no longer termed ‘Tabernacles’ but is known as ‘the eighth day of solemn assembly’. K == Korban (offering); the sacrifice of the day (one bullock, one ram and seven sheep) was quite different from that of the days of Tabernacles. SH == shir (song); the psalm chanted by the Levites was not the same as that for Tabernacles. B == berakah (blessing); on this day, in the time of the Monarchy, a blessing was said for the king, in memory of the dedication of the Temple, when, as we read, on the eighth day the people blessed the king (I Kings, VIII, 66) Cf. Yoma 3a, Suk. 48a.
- (22) A proverbial saying, indicating here that Pentecost should be put on a level in this respect with Passover which has the smaller number of days, not with Tabernacles.
- (23) If the Feast of Weeks is not to be put on the same footing as Tabernacles.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 5a

just as on the feast of Passover [the celebrant is] required to stay overnight¹ [in Jerusalem], so on the feast of Tabernacles he is required to stay overnight. How do we know this in the case of Passover? — Because it is written,² And thou shalt turn in the morning and go unto thy tents.³

But whence then do the First Tanna and R. Simeon⁴ derive the rule of compensation for the Feast of Weeks? — They derive it from the statement of Rabbah b. Samuel; for Rabbah b. Samuel stated: The Torah said, Count days⁵ and sanctify the new moon,⁶ count days and sanctify the Feast of Weeks,⁷ [indicating that] just as the new moon [is sanctified for the period corresponding with the unit of time] by which it is counted,⁸ so the Feast of Weeks [is sanctified for the period corresponding with the unit of time] by which it is counted.⁹ [In that case] I should say that [the compensation period of] the Feast of Weeks is only one day?¹⁰ — Raba replied: Do we count only days to the Feast of Weeks and not weeks [also]? Has not a Master said, It is a mizwah to count days and it is also a mizwah to count weeks?¹¹ And further, we read in the text, ‘the feast of weeks’.¹²

But can the paschal lamb¹³ be offered on any of the festivals? The paschal lamb [surely] has a fixed date:¹⁴ if it is brought then, well and goods but if not, it is rejected?¹⁵ — R. Hisda replied: The paschal lamb is mentioned incidentally. R. Shesheth said: ‘Paschal lamb’ here means the peace-offering [brought] in lieu of the paschal lamb.¹⁶ But if that is so, this is covered by the term

peace-offerings'?¹⁷ — Our authority mentions the peace-offering [which is brought] in lieu of the paschal lamb and he also mentions the peace-offerings which are brought for their own sake. You might be inclined to think that [the former] being brought in lieu of the paschal lamb

-
- (1) I.e., the first night of the intermediate days (Rashi).
 - (2) In connection with the paschal lamb.
 - (3) Deut. XVI, 7. The morning of the first day of the festival obviously cannot be meant, as on that day the celebrant had to bring his festival offering.
 - (4) Who require the whole of this verse for the rule of 'not delaying'.
 - (5) As it is written. Ye shall not eat it one day, nor two days, nor five days, nor ten days, nor twenty days, but a whole month (Num. XI, 19, 20).
 - (6) By sacrifices, v. Num. XXVIII, 11.
 - (7) V. Lev. XXIII, 15. [Read with R. Hananel, Count weeks and sanctify the Feast of Weeks, v. Lev. XXIII, 15].
 - (8) It is counted by days and is sanctified for one day.
 - (9) It is counted by weeks and is sanctified for one week.
 - (10) Since it also says, 'Ye shall count fifty days'. Ibid. 16.
 - (11) To say, e.g., 'seven days which are one week to the 'omer'.
 - (12) Deut. XVI, 16.
 - (13) Mentioned above (p. 11) among the objects to which the rule of 'not delaying' applies.
 - (14) Viz., the fourteenth of Nisan.
 - (15) Lit., 'pushed away'.
 - (16) Lit., 'peace-offerings of the paschal lamb'. If the paschal lamb was not brought at the proper time through being lost, another was declared to be a peace-offering in its place, and this came under the rule of 'not delaying'.
 - (17) Which also occurs in the Baraitha quoted.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 5b

is on the same footing as the paschal lamb.¹ Therefore we are told [that this is not so].

What is the authority [in the Scripture] for these rules? — As our Rabbis have taught: 'When thou shalt vow a vow:² this tells me only [the rule for] a vow; how do I know that a freewill-offering³ is also included? We have here the term 'vow' and in another place⁴ we find the expression if a vow or a free will-offering; just as there a freewill-offering goes with the vow, so here, a freewill-offering goes with it. To the Lord thy God: this indicates money valuations, valuations, devoted things, and consecrated things.⁵ Thou shalt not be slack to pay it: it, but not its substitute.⁶ For he will surely require it: this indicates sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.⁷ The Lord thy God: this indicates charity contributions, tithes and firstborn.⁸ From thee: this indicates gleanings, forgotten sheaves and corners of the field. And it will be sin in thee; but not sin in thy offering.⁹

The Master has [just] said: "'Thou shalt not be slack in paying it"; It and not its substitute'. Substitute for what? If the substitute for a burnt-offering or a peace-offering is meant, this is actually offered.¹⁰ If the substitute for a sin-offering, this is allowed to perish.¹¹ How then are we to understand 'its substitute'? — The substitute for a thanksgiving-offering, as R. Hiyya taught: If a thanksgiving offering became mixed up with its substitute and one of them died, there is no remedy for the other,¹² For what is he [the owner] to do? Shall he offer it and offer the bread¹³ with it? Perhaps it is the substitute.¹⁴ Shall he offer it without the bread? Perhaps it is the original thank-offering. But [if that is so,] seeing that it cannot be offered, why do I require a text to exclude it? — R. Shesheth replied: In point of fact, [the intention of the verse is] to exclude the substitutes for burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and we are dealing here with the case of one which was kept over during two festivals and then became blemished and the owner made it profane by substituting another and this was kept over one festival. You might imagine in this case that since it takes the

place of the first, it is as if it had been kept over for three festivals; therefore we are told that this is not so. But on the view of R. Meir who said that as soon as one festival has been allowed to elapse there is a transgression of the precept 'not to delay', what can be said? — Raba replied: Here we are dealing with a case where the animal became blemished during the festival and he declared it profane [by substituting another], and this was kept over the festival. You might imagine that since it takes the place of the first it is as if it had been kept over during the whole of the festival.¹⁵ Therefore we are told [that this is not so].

"And it will be sin in thee," but not sin in thy offering'. Do we derive this lesson from here? Surely it is derived from the text adduced by the 'Others', as it has been taught: 'Others say, I might say that a firstling after a year has passed¹⁶ is like consecrated things that have become disqualified¹⁷ and so is disqualified. Therefore it says, And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God the tithe of thy corn and of thy wine and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herd and of thy flock.¹⁸ Here firstling is mentioned alongside of tithe, [to indicate that] just as tithe is not disqualified by being kept from one year to another,¹⁹ so a firstling is not disqualified by being kept from one year to another.' — It was still necessary [to learn the lesson in the other way]. For you might have imagined that this applies only to a firstling, which is not for appeasement, but consecrated²⁰ things which are for appeasement²¹ will not appease [if kept over]. Therefore I am told that this is not so.

But still [I may object that]

-
- (1) And the transgression of 'not delaying' is incurred with the passing of one festival (Rashi).
 - (2) Deut. XXIII, 22.
 - (3) In making a vow a man said, 'I undertake to bring such-and-such an offering'; in making a freewill-offering he said, 'I undertake to bring this animal as an offering'.
 - (4) Lev. VII, 16.
 - (5) V. supra p. 11 nn. 5-8. Because all these went for the repair of the Temple and not to the priests.
 - (6) This is explained below.
 - (7) All these as distinct from the vow and freewill-offerings were an obligation the fulfilment of which could be demanded. The burnt-offerings and peace-offerings referred to are those which were brought as an additional offering on the festival. If they had been already set aside, they could be brought on a subsequent festival (V. Tosaf., s.v. **לשם**).
 - (8) The words 'the Lord thy God' here are strictly speaking superfluous, and can therefore be used for an exposition.
 - (9) I.e., the offering is not disqualified thereby.
 - (10) If the original animal was lost and another substituted and then the first was found, both are offered and the substitute also comes under the rule of 'not delaying'.
 - (11) And never offered.
 - (12) I.e., it must be allowed to perish.
 - (13) V. Lev. VII, 12, 13.
 - (14) And according to Men. 79b, bread was not to be brought with the substitute of a thanksgiving-offering.
 - (15) And thus, according to R. Meir, is the rule of 'not delaying' transgressed.
 - (16) A firstling has to be sacrificed within its first year, v. Deut. XV, 20.
 - (17) For being offered on the altar.
 - (18) Deut. XIV, 23.
 - (19) Because it says, At the end of every three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe etc., Deut. XIV, 28.
 - (20) E.g., burnt — and sin-offerings.
 - (21) Heb. **לְרַצוֹן** Lev. I, 3 et al. E.V. 'that he (it) may be accepted.'

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 6a

the lesson is derived from the exposition of Ben 'Azzai, as It has been taught: Ben 'Azzai said: What is the point of the word otho [it]?¹ Since it says, Thou shalt not be slack in paying it,² I might think that a vow which is delayed also fails to appease. Therefore it says, 'it': this one fails to appease, but

a delayed vow does not fail to appease! — No; [what we must say is], “in thee a sin”, but not in thy wife a sin’. For you might think that, since R. Johanan [or, as some say, R. Eleazar] has said, ‘A man’s wife dies only because money is [rightfully] demanded of him and he has it not,’³ as it says, Why should he take thy bed from under thee?’⁴ and so I would say that his wife will die also because of this transgression of ‘not delaying’. We are therefore told [that this is not so].

Our Rabbis taught: ‘That which is gone out of thy lips:⁵ this is an affirmative precept.⁶ Thou shalt observe: this is a negative precept. And do: this is an injunction to the Beth din to make thee do, According as thou hast vowed: this means a vow. To the Lord thy God: this means sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.⁷ A freewill-offering:⁸ this has its literal meaning. Even that which thou hast promised: this means things sanctified for the repair of the Temple. With thy mouth: this means charity.’

The Master has here said that “that which is gone out of thy lips” implies an affirmative precept’. Why do I require the words for this purpose? This lesson can be derived from the words, and thither thou shalt come and thither ye shall bring.⁹ “Thou shalt observe”; this implies a negative precept’. Why do I require these words? This lesson can be derived from ‘thou shalt not be slack in paying it’.¹⁰ “And do”: this is an injunction to the Beth din to make thee do’. Why do I require these words? This lesson can be derived from he shall bring it,¹¹ as it has been taught: He shall bring it: this teaches us that he is to be constrained¹² [if necessary]. I might say, even against his will. Therefore it says, of his own will.¹³ What is to be done then? We constrain him until he says ‘I am willing’. [What is the answer?] — The one [set of texts¹⁴ deal with the case] where he had pledged himself but had not yet set aside the animal, the other with the case where he had set it aside but had not yet offered it. And both are required. For if the rule had been laid down only for the case where he had pledged himself but had not yet set aside the animal, [I might say that the reason is] because he has not yet carried out his word, but where he has set it aside but not yet offered it I might argue that wherever it is, it is in the treasury of the All-Merciful. These texts therefore were necessary. And if again the rule had been laid down only for the cases where he has set the animal aside but not yet offered it, I might say that the reason is because he is keeping it by him, but if he has pledged himself without having yet set it aside I might argue that his mere word counts for nothing. Therefore these texts are also necessary.

But how can you say that [one set of texts is] where he has pledged himself but not yet set aside, seeing that ‘freewill-offering’ is mentioned, and we have learnt, What is a vow? When a man says, I pledge myself to bring a burnt-offering. What is a freewill-offering? Where a man says, I declare this to be a burnt-offering. What is the difference [in practice] between a vow and a freewill-offering? If [an animal set aside to perform] a vow dies or is stolen, he has to replace it, but if a freewill-offering dies or is stolen he is not bound to replace it! — Raba replied: You can find a freewill-offering of this kind¹⁵ in the case where he said, ‘I pledge myself to bring a burnt-offering on condition that I shall not be obliged to replace it’.

“With thy mouth”: this is charity’. Raba said: For [paying] charity-offerings one becomes liable at once. What is the reason? Because the poor are waiting.¹⁶ Surely this is obvious? — [Not so, since] you might think that, as charity is mentioned in the passage dealing with offerings, [it need not be paid] till three festivals have elapsed, as in the case of offerings. We are therefore told that this is not so. Only the others [the offerings] were made by the All-Merciful dependent on the festivals, but this [charity] is not so, because the poor are waiting.¹⁷

Raba said: As soon as one festival has elapsed, he transgresses an affirmative precept. The following objection was raised:¹⁸ R. Joshua and R. Pappias testified regarding the offspring of a peace-offering¹⁹ that it should also be brought as a peace-offering. R. Pappias said: I testify that we had a heifer which was sacrificed as a peace-offering, and we ate it on Passover, and we ate its

young as a peace-offering on the Festival.²⁰ Now I can understand why it was not offered on Passover, the ground being that it was still too short-lived.²¹ But how could the young be kept over Pentecost, which would involve the transgression of an affirmative precept? — R. Zebid said in the name of Raba: It may have been

-
- (1) In Lev. VII, 18, If any of the flesh . . . be eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it. The word otho could be dispensed with.
- (2) Deut. XXIII, 22.
- (3) E.g., if he vows without having the wherewithal to pay.
- (4) Prov. XXII, 27, referring to those who go surety.
- (5) Deut. XXIII, 24.
- (6) Because we understand the word 'carry out'.
- (7) V. supra, p. II
- (8) Heb. נְדָבָה E.V., 'freely'.
- (9) Deut. XII, 5, 6. V. p. 12, n. 8.
- (10) Which occurs just above in Deut. XXIII, v. 22.
- (11) Lev. I, 3.
- (12) By physical force.
- (13) לְרַצְנוֹ E.V., 'that he may be accepted'.
- (14) Explicitly in Deut. XXIII, verse 24, and by derivation in verse 22; v. supra p. 5b (Rashi).
- (15) One in respect of which he has pledged himself without setting aside.
- (16) Lit., 'are standing'.
- (17) Lit., 'are to be found'. MS.M. omits, 'Only . . . waiting'.
- (18) 'Ed. 7.
- (19) If the animal was consecrated when pregnant, or became pregnant subsequently, and gave birth before being sacrificed.
- (20) Heb. אֹהֶל, which usually designates Tabernacles.
- (21) Lit. 'deficient in time'. I.e., not yet eight days old. V. Lev. XXII, 27.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 6b

that it was sick on Pentecost. R. Ashi said: What is meant by the statement 'we ate its young as a peace-offering on the Festival'? it means, the Feast of Weeks. What says the other to this? — [He says that] wherever [Pentecost] is mentioned in connection with Passover, it is called 'Assembly' ['azereth].¹

Raba said: As soon as three festivals have elapsed, he transgresses every day the precept of 'not delaying'. The following was cited in objection to this: [The rule] both for a firstling and for all consecrated animals is that so soon as they have been kept back a year [even] without three festivals,² or three festivals even it less than a year, the precept of 'not delaying' is transgressed. What objection is there here?³ — R. Kahana said: The objection is a sound one.⁴ See now: the Tanna is looking for prohibitions; let him then state, 'he transgresses the precept of "not delaying" every day'.⁵ What says the other to this? — [He says that] the Tanna is only anxious to stamp the act as forbidden;⁶ he does not look for extra prohibitions.⁷

[To revert to] the [above] text: '[The rule] both for a firstling and for all consecrated animals is that so soon as they have been kept back a year even without three festivals or three festivals even if less than a year, the precept of "not delaying" is transgressed'. I grant that three festivals without a year are possible; but how is a year possible without three festivals? And I still grant that this is possible for one who requires the three festivals to be in order, but for one who does not require them to be in order how is it possible? And I still grant that this is possible for Rabbi in a leap year, since it has been taught, [It is written] 'a complete year'⁸: Rabbi says, he [the seller] reckons three

hundred and sixty-five days, which is the number of days in the solar year, while the Sages say that he reckons twelve months from day to day,⁹ and if it is a leap year he gets the benefit.¹⁰ — It is possible for Rabbi [to have a year without three festivals] in the case where one sanctified the animal after¹¹ the festival of Passover, since when the end of the next second Adar¹² comes round the year is completed but the number of festivals is not completed. But for the Rabbis how is it possible? — [It is possible] on the basis of what R. Shemaiah learnt: Pentecost is sometimes on the fifth of the [third] month, sometimes on the sixth, and sometimes on the seventh. For instance, if both of them¹³ are full,¹⁴ it is on the fifth;¹⁵ if both of them are defective.,¹⁶ it is on the seventh; if one is full and the other defective, it is on the sixth.¹⁷ Who is the Tanna who takes a different view from R. Shemaiah?¹⁸ It is the ‘Others’, as it has been taught: Others say that between Pentecost and Pentecost, between New Year and New Year there is always an interval of four days [of the week],¹⁹ or, in a leap year, five.²⁰

R. Zera asked: Does the rule of ‘not delaying’ apply to an heir?²¹ [Do we reason that] the All-Merciful has said ‘When thou shalt vow a vow’, and he has not made a vow, or [perhaps we apply the text], and thither thou shalt come and thither shall ye bring,²² and he also is liable?²³ — Come and hear, since R. Hiyya has taught: ‘From thee [me'imak]’:²⁴ this excludes the heir. But this ‘me'imak’ is required to bring under the rule gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and corners of the field?²⁵ — I expound ‘imak, and I expound me'imak.’²⁶

R. Zera also asked: Does the rule of ‘not delaying’ apply to a woman? Do we reason that she is not obliged to appear [at Jerusalem on the festivals]²⁷ or perhaps do we reason that she is enjoined to rejoice?²⁸ — Abaye replied: Is not the answer provided by the fact that she is enjoined to rejoice? But could Abaye say this, seeing that Abaye has said that a woman is made joyful by her husband?²⁹ Abaye was answering R. Zera on his own premises.

The question was raised: From what day is the year of the firstling reckoned? — Abaye said, From the hour of its birth; R. Aha b. Jacob said, From the time when it can be used for appeasement.³⁰ Nor is there any conflict of opinion between them; one speaks of an animal without blemish,³¹

(1) The Rabbinic term for Pentecost; and therefore **אָהַרְבָּיִם** here must mean Tabernacles.

(2) This statement is discussed infra.

(3) There is no contradiction between this statement and that of Raba.

(4) Lit., ‘he who raises the objection objects well’.

(5) And since he does not say so, we presume that he is in disagreement with Raba.

(6) Lit., ‘to fix it in a prohibition’.

(7) But all the same he would agree with Raba.

(8) Within which a house sold in a walled city could be compulsorily redeemed. Lev. XXV, 29.

(9) Which in an ordinary year is only 354 days according to the Jewish calendar.

(10) The year in this case being 383 days.

(11) Strictly speaking it must be during passover, since 365 days would not elapse from after Passover till the end of the next Adar sheni. Or ‘the end of Adar’ may be used loosely to signify the days between then and Passover.

(12) The second Adar in a leap year.

(13) The months of Nisan and Iyar.

(14) I.e., contain thirty days.

(15) This being the fiftieth day from the second day of Passover.

(16) I.e., contain only 29 days.

(17) Hence if pentecost is in one year on the fifth and he sanctifies on the sixth, and the next year Pentecost is on the seventh, a full twelvemonth can pass without three festivals.

(18) And would not count a year without three festivals.

(19) They held that the months are full and defective in strict rotation, and the twelvemonth consequently has 354 days, which is four days over 50 weeks. On this view, Pentecost must always be on the sixth of Sivan.

- (20) It being assumed that the intercalary month consists always of twenty-nine days. i.e., four weeks and a day.
- (21) Whose father made a vow which he had not fulfilled before his death.
- (22) V. supra p. 12, n. 8.
- (23) To 'come' and consequently to 'bring'.
- (24) Deut. XXIII, 22.
- (25) V. supra p. 11.
- (26) 'Imak' means 'from thee', and this would be sufficient for the rule; we therefore derive an additional lesson from the form me 'imak (lit., 'from with thee').
- (27) Since it says, shall all thy males appear (Deut. XVI, 16).
- (28) Which implies partaking of the peace-offerings. v. pes. 109a, and as she must go to Jerusalem for this purpose, she must also 'not delay' the vow'
- (29) With fine clothes, v. Kid. 34b.
- (30) I.e., sacrifice, viz., on the eighth day, v. Lev. XXII, 27.
- (31) Which can be sacrificed on the eighth day.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 7a

, the other of an animal with a blemish.¹ Can a blemished animal be eaten [on the day of birth]?² [We speak of one] of which we know for certain that it has not been born prematurely.³

Our Rabbis taught: On the first of Nisan is New Year for months,⁴ for leap-years,⁵ and for the offering of shekalim;⁶ some say, also for the renting of houses.⁷

'New Year for months': whence do we know this? — Because it is written, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you. Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take unto then: every man a lamb, according to their fathers' houses, a lamb for a household. . . and ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month, and they shall kill it⁸ etc. It is also written [elsewhere],⁹ Observe the month of Abib¹⁰ [springing corn]. Now which is the month in which there is springing corn? You must say this is Nisan; and this is called 'first'. But cannot I say that it is Iyar? — We require springing corn', and there is none. But cannot I say that it is Adar? — We require the bulk of the springing corn, and this we have not [in Adar]. But does the text say, 'the bulk of the springing corn'? Rather, said R. Hisda; we learn it from here: Howbeit on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruits of the land.¹¹ What is the month in which there is 'gathering in'?¹² You must say that this is Tishri, and the text calls it 'seventh'. But cannot I say that it is Marheshvan, and by 'seventh' is meant the seventh to Iyar? — We require 'gathering in', and this we have not [in Marheshvan]. But cannot I say that it is Elul, and by seventh' is meant seventh to Adar? — We require the bulk of the ingathering, which we have not [in Elul]. But does the text say, 'the bulk of the ingathering'? — The fact is, said Rabina, that we cannot learn this from the Torah of Moses our teacher, but we have to learn it from the later Scriptures,¹³ [viz.,] Upon the four and twentieth day of the eleventh month, which is the month Shebat.¹⁴ Rabbah b. 'ulla said, [We learn it] from here: So Esther was taken unto king Ahasuerus into his house royal in the tenth month which is the month Tebeth.¹⁵ R. Kahana said: [We learn it] from here, In the fourth day of the ninth month, even in Kislev.¹⁶ R. Aha b. Jacob said, [We learn it] from here: Then were the king's scribes called at that time in the third month which is the month of Sivan.¹⁷ R. Ashi said, [We learn it] from here: They cast pur, that is, the lot, before Haman from day to day and from month to month to the twelfth month, which is the month Adar.¹⁸ If you prefer, I can learn it from here: In the first month which is the month Nisan.¹⁹ Why did not all the others derive it from here?²⁰ — Perhaps 'first' here means, 'first in relation to his [Haman's] affair'.²¹

Why did not our Tanna²² [reckon the first of Nisan as the New Year for months]? — Our Tanna speaks only of years, he does not speak of months.

‘For leap years’. Do we reckon [a New Year] for leap years from Nisan?²³ Has it not been taught: ‘A leap year is not decreed²⁴ before New Year,²⁵ and if such a decree is issued it is not effective. In cases of emergency,²⁶ however, the decree may be issued immediately after New Year, and even so the intercalary month must be [the second] Adar’!²⁷ — R. Nahman b. Isaac replied: What is meant here by ‘leap years’? The closing of a leap year, as we have learnt: ‘They’s testified that the year may be declared a leap year throughout the whole of Adar, since others asserted that this could be done only until Purim.’²⁸ What was the reason of those who held that this could be done only until Purim? — Since a Master has stated that ‘enquiries are made regarding the laws of Passover for thirty days before Passover,²⁹ People might be led into neglecting the rules of leaven.’³⁰ What says the other to this? — He says that people know that a leap year depends on calculation, and they say to themselves that the Rabbis have only now got the calculation right.³¹

What of our Tanna?³² — He speaks only of commencements, not of terminations.

‘And for the offering of shekalim’.³³ How do we know this [from Scripture]? — R. Josiah said: The Scripture says, This is the burnt-offering of each month in its month throughout the months of the year.³⁴ The Torah here enjoins:³⁵ ‘Renew [the year] and bring an offering from the new contributions’. That the ‘year’ here commences with Nisan is learnt by analogy with the text,³⁶ It is the first to you of the months of the year.³⁷ But why not suppose it is Tishri from the analogy of, From the beginning of the year?³⁸ — To a year with which months are mentioned we apply the analogy of a year with which months are mentioned, but to a year with which months are not mentioned, we do not apply the analogy of a year with which months are not mentioned.

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: It is proper to bring the congregational sacrifices that are offered on the first of Nisan from the new contributions. If, however, they are brought from the old, the duty has been performed,³⁹ but not in the most appropriate manner.⁴⁰ It has been taught to the same effect: ‘It is proper to bring the congregational sacrifices which are offered on the first of Nisan from the new contributions; if, however, they were brought from the old, the duty has been performed, but not in the most appropriate manner. If a private person has offered them from his own property, they are unexceptionable, provided he hands them over to the congregation’. Surely this is self-evident? — You might think that we should have some scruples [in accepting them], in case

(1) Which can be eaten as ordinary non-sacrificial flesh,

(2) Perhaps it has been born prematurely and cannot survive, v. Shab. 135b.

(3) Lit., ‘that its months have been completed’.

(4) I.e., the order of months commences with Nisan.

(5) V. infra.

(6) For first using for the purchase of congregational sacrifices the shekalim that were collected in Adar. Cf. Meg. 29b.

(7) V. infra.

(8) Ex. XII, 2-6. Only the first of these verses need have been quoted.

(9) In connection with the Passover.

(10) Deut. XVI, 1.

(11) Lev., XXIII, 39.

(12) When the produce is brought in from the fields to save it from the approaching rain.

(13) Lit., ‘words of Kabbalah’ (tradition), a name given in the Talmud to the Prophetic writings and the Hagiographa, v. B.K., Sonc. ed., p. 3, n. 3.

(14) Zech. I, 7.

(15) Esth. II, 16.

(16) Sech. VII, 1.

(17) Esth. VIII, 9.

(18) Ibid., III, 7.

- (19) Ibid.
- (20) Since Nisan is mentioned explicitly.
- (21) With regard to the others also it might be asked why more than one quotation is needed. Perhaps the idea was to show that there had been no change in the names of the months since the time of 'kabbalah'. V. however, Tosaf. s.v. **מדברי**.
- (22) The Tanna of our Mishnah.
- (23) I.e., can the Beth din even in Nisan declare that the year just begun is to be a leap year?
- (24) In the time of the Second Temple the calendar was not fixed, but the Beth din declared any year a leap year (i.e., inserted an intercalary month) according as they judged necessary, subject to certain rules.
- (25) Because if this were done, by the time Adar came round people might forget.
- (26) E.g., if they were afraid that they might be prevented from issuing the decree later.
- (27) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 55 notes. (15) R. Joshua and R. Pappias. Sanh. 87a Ed. VII, 7.
- (28) And once Purim had passed, the next month had to be Nisan of the next year and not the second Adar of the present year.
- (29) I.e., the emissaries of the Beth din instructed the public on the matter during this time.
- (30) If in the interval Passover was postponed for a month, they would not observe the new date of the Passover.
- (31) Lit., 'this calculation had not been completed by the Rabbis till now'.
- (32) Why does he not include leap years.
- (33) In Adar a shekel had to be contributed by every Israelite for the purchase of congregational sacrifices during the coming year.
- (34) Num. XXVIII, 14.
- (35) By the superfluous expression, 'throughout the months of the year'.
- (36) 'And we derive (the meaning of) "year" from "year" (commencing) with Nisan'.
- (37) Ex. XII, 2.
- (38) Deut. XI, 12, referring to the rainfall.
- (39) In respect of the sacrifice itself.
- (40) Lit. 'he has omitted a precept'.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 7b

he has not transferred them with all his heart.¹ We are told therefore [that this is not necessary].

Why does our Tanna [not reckon New Year for shekalim]? — Since it is laid down that if the sacrifices are brought [from the old contributions] the duty is still performed, he was not certain [whether this should be counted a New Year].

'Some say, Also for the renting of houses'. Our Rabbis have taught: 'If a man lets a house to another for a year, he reckons it as twelve months from day to day.² If, however, he stipulates "for this year", then even if the tenant only entered into occupation³ on the first of Adar, as soon as the first of Nisan arrives,⁴ a year has been completed.' And even according to those who say that one day in the year is reckoned as a year, this does not apply here, because a man would not trouble to rent a house for less than thirty days. But why should I not say that Tishri [is the New Year for letting houses]?⁵ — It is taken for granted that when a man takes a house [in Tishri], he takes it for the whole of the rainy season. Why do the first Tanna of the Baraitha and our Tanna [not reckon the renting of houses]? — In Nisan also there is often cloudy weather.⁶

ON THE FIRST OF ELUL IS NEW YEAR FOR THE TITHE OF CATTLE. Who is the authority for this? — It is R. Meir, as it has been taught: 'R. Meir says, On the first of Elul is New Year for the tithe of cattle'. Who is the authority in respect of festivals? It is R. Simeon,⁷ Now look at the succeeding clause: R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON SAY, ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI. [Am I to say that] the first and third statements here follow the authority of R. Simeon and the middle one that of R. Meir? — R. Joseph said: The authority here is Rabbi, and he decides now in accordance with

one, now with another Tanna. In respect of festivals he concurs with R. Simeon, and in respect of tithe of cattle he concurs with R. Meir. If that is so, how can he say FOUR [New Years]? There are five?⁸ — Raba replied: There are four according to all authorities. There are four according to R. Meir, excluding the festivals,⁹ and four according to R. Simeon, excluding the tithe of cattle.¹⁰ R. Nahman b. Isaac said: [The meaning of our Mishnah is], There are four months in which there are a number of New Years.¹¹

An objection was raised: ‘The sixteenth of Nisan is the New Year for the ‘Omer;¹² the sixth of Sivan is the New Year for the two loaves’.¹³ Now [this being so], according to Raba the Mishnah should say six, and according to R. Nahman b. Isaac five? — R. Papa said: In fixing the number, [the Tanna] reckons only such [New Years] as commence with the evening,¹⁴ he does not reckon those that do not commence with¹⁵ the evening.¹⁶ But what of festivals which [in respect of vows] do not commence with the evening¹⁷ and yet are reckoned? — Since he has to bring [his vow], he becomes guilty [of ‘delaying’] from the very commencement [of the festival].¹⁸ But what of Jubilees which do not commence with the evening,¹⁹ and yet are reckoned in? — This follows the view of R. Johanan b. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, who said that the Jubilee commences with the New Year. R. Shisha the son of R. Idi said: In fixing the number, [the Tanna] reckoned only New Years that are not inaugurated with some ceremony,²⁰ but he does not reckon those that are inaugurated with a ceremony.²¹ But what of festivals, which [in respect of vows] are inaugurated with a ceremony,²² and yet are not reckoned? — The [transgression of] ‘not delaying’ comes automatically.²³

(1) Lit., ‘very well’.

(2) I.e., from a date in one month to the same date in the same month next year.

(3) Lit., ‘stood’.

(4) I.e., as soon as thirty days have passed.

(5) So that, if a man rents a house on the first of Elul for a year, he takes it only to the first of Tishri.

(6) And therefore at no time would a man if he took a house for a year mean merely thirty days.

(7) As explained above, that R. Simeon requires three festivals in order in the matter of vows, and he is therefore the authority for the first statement in the Mishnah, that there is a New Year for festivals.

(8) The New Year for festivals being on the fifteenth of Nisan.

(9) Since R. Meir is of the view that the transgression is involved after the lapse of one festival. V. supra 4b.

(10) I.e., the first of Elul as a separate New Year; since R. Simeon places it on the first of Tishri which is in any case a new year.

(11) There being two in Nisan, and these are counted as one.

(12) I.e., for making permissible the new corn. Lev. XXIII, 14.

(13) For bringing meal-offerings from the new corn. Ibid. 17.

(14) E.g., the New Year for kings commences with the evening of the first of Nisan.

(15) Lit., ‘full’.

(16) As instanced presently.

(17) It being assumed that the precept of ‘not delaying’ is not transgressed till the hour arrives when the animal vowed may be offered, i.e., till the perpetual offering of the morning is brought.

(18) Even though he is unable to bring the sacrifice till the morning.

(19) But which are ushered in with a blast of the shofar on the Day of Atonement, in the daytime.

(20) Lit. ‘depend on an act’. I.e., the New Years which begin with the advent of the day itself.

(21) The prohibition of the new corn for personal consumption and for offerings respectively is raised only by the offering of the Omer and the two loaves.

(22) No sacrifice could be offered before the bringing of the daily morning sacrifice.

(23) As soon as the Festival sets in.

But what of Jubilees?¹ — This follows the authority of R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka. R. Ashi said: [The meaning of our Mishnah is,] There are four New Years which fall on four firsts of the month.² [Do you then reckon] the first of Shebat [as one and so] follow Beth Shammai?³ — He [R. Ashi] meant it in this way: There are three according to all authorities; with regard to the first of Shebat there is a difference of opinion between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel.

R. ELEAZAR AND R. SIMEON SAID, ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI. R. Johanan said: They both based their opinions on the same verse, viz., The rams have mounted the sheep⁴ and the valleys also are covered over with corn, they shout for joy, yea, they sing.⁵ R. Meir reasoned: When do the rams mount the sheep? At the time when the valleys are covered over with corn. And when are the valleys covered over with corn? In Adar. The sheep conceive in Adar and bear in Ab,⁶ and their New Year is in Elul. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon said: When do the rams mount the sheep? At the time when they [the ears of corn] shout for joy and sing.⁷ When do the ears of corn burst into song? In Nisan. They conceive in Nisan and bear in Elul, and their New Year is in Tishri. How then does the other [R. Meir] account for the words, ‘they shout for joy, yea they sing’? — This refers to the late ones, whose conception takes place in Nisan. But how then does the other [R. Eleazar] account for the words, the valleys are covered with corn? — That refers to the early ones, whose conception takes place in Adar. Now according to R. Meir, there is no difficulty; the text says, ‘The rams mount the sheep’, to wit at the time when ‘the valleys are covered with corn’, but there are some also [which do not conceive till] they shout aloud and sing’. But on the view of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon, the clauses should be reversed, thus: ‘The rams mount the sheep’, to wit, at the time when the ears of corn ‘shout for joy and sing’, but there are some which do so [already] ‘when the valleys are covered with corn’? — The fact is, said Raba, that all authorities hold that the rams mount the sheep at the time when the valleys are covered with corn, which is in Adar, but where they differ is in the exposition of the following text, viz., Thou shalt surely tithe,⁸ [in regard to which we have learnt that] the Scripture speaks of two tithes, the tithe of cattle and the tithe of corn. Now R. Meir was of opinion that the tithe of cattle is put on the same footing as the tithe of corn in this way: just as corn becomes liable to tithe, soon after it reaches completion,⁹ so cattle becomes liable to tithe soon after it reaches completion.¹⁰ R. Eleazar and R. Simeon again held that the tithe of cattle is put on the same footing as the tithe of corn in this way: just as the New Year for the tithe of corn is in Tishri, so the New Year for the tithe of cattle is in Tishri.

ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI IS NEW YEAR FOR YEARS. What legal bearing has this? — R. Papa said: For [determining the validity of] documents, as we have learnt, ‘Bonds if antedated are invalid, but if postdated are valid’.¹¹ But we have learnt, ON THE FIRST OF NISAN IS NEW YEAR FOR KINGS, and we asked, What is the legal bearing of this, and R. Hisda replied, For [determining the validity of] documents?¹² — There is no contradiction; the one statement refers to kings of Israel, the other to kings of other nations. What then of the dictum of R. Hisda, ‘This statement refers only to the kings of Israel, but for the kings of other nations we reckon from Tishri’; was R. Hisda telling us only something that we already know from a Mishnah? — No; R. Hisda wanted to tell us the import of some Scriptural verses.¹³ If you like I can say that R. Hisda explains the Mishnah here in the same way as R. Zera, since R. Zera said [that it¹⁴ means], for reckoning cycles,¹⁵ in this following the view of R. Eleazar, who said that the world was created in Tishri.¹⁶ R. Nahman b. Isaac [explained the Mishnah to refer] to the Divine judgment ‘as it is written, From the beginning of the year to the end of the year,¹⁷ [which means], From the beginning of the year sentence is passed as to what shall be up to the end of it. How do we know that this takes place in Tishri? — Because it is written, Blow the horn at the new moon, at the covered time [keseh]¹⁸ for our feastday.¹⁹ Which is the feast

(1) V. n. 2.

(2) And for this reason the New Year for the Omer and the two loaves are not included in our Mishnah.

(3) V. Mishnah.

- (4) E.V., ‘The meadows are clothed with flocks’.
- (5) Ps. LXV, 14.
- (6) Six months being allowed for pregnancy.
- (7) A poetic description of the rustling of the ears. It is doubtful whether we can find here an allusion to the idea that ‘all creatures sing a certain chant before the Holy One, blessed be He’.
- (8) Lit., ‘tithing thou shalt tithe’, Deut., XIV, 22.
- (9) I.e., after it has become thoroughly dried in the fields, in Elul, v. infra 12a.
- (10) I.e., after it is born, in Ab.
- (11) V. supra, p. 2, n. 2.
- (12) Which shows that the year for documents is dated from Nisan and not Tishri.
- (13) I.e., he was telling us that we can learn from the Scriptures that the years of non-Israelitish kings are reckoned from Tishri. V. supra p. 7.
- (14) The statement ON THE FIRST OF TISHRI IS THE NEW YEAR FOR YEARS.
- (15) I.e., the cycle of Tishri is the first of the four cycles of the year, v. infra p. 43, n. 9. The year is divided into four cycles called Tekufoth, the Tekufah of Nisan (Vernal Equinox); Tammuz (Summer Solstice); Tishri (Autumn Equinox); Tebeth (Winter Solstice). The term Tekufah is also applied to the season itself.
- (16) V. infra 10b.
- (17) Deut. XI, 12. The verse continues, the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it (the land of Canaan).
- (18) E.V., ‘appointed time’, or ‘full moon’.
- (19) Ps. LXXXI, 4.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 8b

on which the moon is covered over [mithkaseh]? You must say that this is New Year;¹ and it is written [in this connection], For it is a statute for Israel, an ordinance for the God of Jacob.²

Our Rabbis taught: ‘For it is a statute for Israel, an ordinance for the God of Jacob’: this teaches that the heavenly Beth din does not assemble for judgment until the Beth din on earth has sanctified the month’.

Another [Baraita] taught: ‘For it is a statute for Israel’; this tells me only that Israel [are judged]; how do I know that this applies also to the [other] nations of this world? Because it is written, an ordinance for the God of Jacob’. If that is the case, what is the point of saying, For it is a statute for Israel?³ — It teaches that Israel are brought up for trial first. And this is in harmony with the [following] saying of R. Hisda. For R. Hisda said: Where a king⁴ and a community appear together, the king is brought up for judgment first, as it says, the judgment of his servant [Solomon] and the judgment of his people.⁵ What is the reason? — If you like I can say, because it is not seemly that the king should stand outside, and if you like I can say, [the king is tried] before [the Divine] wrath becomes really fierce.⁶

FOR RELEASE YEARS. How do we know this [from the Scripture]? — Because it is written, And in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land,⁷ and that this commences with Tishri we learn from the analogy with the word ‘year’⁸ in from the beginning of the year.⁹ But let us learn that it is Nisan from analogy with the word ‘year’ in the text, it is the first to you of the months of the year?¹⁰ — We draw an analogy to a year with which months are not mentioned from a year with which months are not mentioned, but we do not draw an analogy to a year with which months are not mentioned from a year with which months are mentioned.¹¹

AND FOR JUBILEE YEARS. [is the New Year for] Jubilees on the first of Tishri? Surely [the New Year for] Jubilees is on the tenth of Tishri, as it is written, on the day of atonement shall ye make proclamation with the horn?¹² — What authority is here followed? R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka, as it has been taught: And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year.¹³ What is the point of

these words? [It is this]. Since it says, On the day of atonement [ye shall make proclamation],¹² I might think that the year is sanctified only from the Day of Atonement onwards. Therefore it says, And ye shall sanctify the fiftieth year. This teaches that it is sanctified from its inception. On this ground R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka laid down that from New Year to the Day of Atonement slaves were neither dismissed to their homes nor subjected to their masters, but they ate and drank and made merry, wearing garlands on their heads.¹⁴ When the Day of Atonement came, the Beth din sounded the horn; slaves were dismissed to their homes and fields returned to their original owners. And the Rabbis [— what do they make of this verse]? — [They say it teaches that] you are to sanctify years but not months.¹⁵

Another [Baraitha] taught: ‘It is a Jubilee.’¹⁶ What is the point of these words? — Since it says, And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year,¹³ I might think that, just as it is sanctified from its inception onwards, so it remains sanctified [for a time] after its termination. And there would be nothing to wonder at in this, seeing that we [regularly] add from the profane on to the holy.¹⁷ Therefore it says, it is a Jubilee to you, the fiftieth year, [to show that] you are to sanctify the fiftieth year, but not the fifty-first year.¹⁸

-
- (1) The only feast which takes place when the moon is hidden.
 - (2) Ibid. 5.
 - (3) For if the other nations are judged, a plus forte raison Israel.
 - (4) Israel being regarded as a king in relation to the other nations.
 - (5) I Kings, VIII, 59.
 - (6) Being inflamed by the sins of the community.
 - (7) Lev. XXV, 4.
 - (8) And he derives (the meaning of) ‘year’ from ‘year’ (commencing) with Tishri.
 - (9) Deut. XI, 12, which refers to Tishri.
 - (10) Ex. XII, 2.
 - (11) V. supra p, 7a.
 - (12) Lev. XXV, 9, referring to the Jubilee.
 - (13) Ibid 10. These words are apparently superfluous, it having already been said, and thou shalt number forty-nine years.
 - (14) In sign of their approaching freedom.
 - (15) Cf. infra 24a.
 - (16) Lev. XXV, II.
 - (17) V. infra.
 - (18) The word ‘it’ being specific.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 9a

And the Rabbis [— what do they make of these words]?¹ — [They say]: You are to count the fiftieth year, but you are not to count the fifty-first,² to exclude the view of R. Judah, who said that the fiftieth year is reckoned both ways.³ We are here told that this is not so.

And how do we know [from the Scripture] that we add from the profane on to the holy?⁴ — As it has been taught: In plowing time and in harvest time thou shalt rest.⁵ R. Akiba, [commenting on this,] said: There was no need [for Scripture] to specify the ploughing and harvest of the Sabbatical year, since this has already been mentioned [in] thy field thou shalt not sow etc.⁶ What must be meant therefore is the ploughing of the year before the seventh which is passing into the seventh,⁷ and the harvest of the seventh year which is continuing into the period after the seventh year.⁸ R. Ishmael said: Just as ploughing is optional,⁹ so the harvest [here referred to] is an optional one, excluding the harvesting of the ‘Omer, which is a religious duty.¹⁰ Whence then does R. Ishmael derive the rule that an addition is to be made from the profane on to the holy? — From what has

been taught: And ye shall afflict your souls on the ninth day:¹¹ I might think [literally] on the ninth day. It therefore says, In the evening.¹² if in the evening, I might think, after dark? It therefore says, 'or, the ninth day'.¹³ What then am I to understand? That we begin fasting while it is yet day; which shows that we add from the profane on to the holy. I know this [so far] only in regard to the inception [of the holy day]; how do I know it in regard to its termination? Because it says, from evening to evening.¹² So far I have brought only the Day of Atonement under the rule; how do I know that it applies to Sabbaths also? Because it says, ye shall rest.¹⁴ How do I know that it applies to festivals? Because it says, your Sabbath.¹⁴ How am I to understand this? That wherever there is an obligation to rest, we add from the profane on to the holy.

What then does R. Akiba make of this, 'and ye shall afflict your souls on the ninth day'? — He requires it for the lesson learnt by R. Hiyya b. Rab from Difti.¹⁵ For R. Hiyya b. Rab from Difti learnt: 'And ye shall afflict your souls on the ninth day'. Do we then fast on the ninth day? Is it not on the tenth day that we fast? [We do]; but [the use of this word] indicates that if a man eats and drinks on the ninth day, the Scripture accounts it to him

(1) They have no need of this lesson, seeing that they do not consider the year sanctified from its inception. (Cf. Tosaf. s.v. **גרבנין** 8b).

(2) Lit. 'the year fifty and first'. So our texts, the meaning being, according to Rashi, that you are not to reckon the fiftieth year as fiftieth to the Jubilee and first to the next septennate. Tosaf., by a slight change of wording, renders: 'You are to count the fiftieth year (as fiftieth to the Jubilee), but you are not to count the fiftieth year as one (to the following septennate)', which is a smoother reading.

(3) As fiftieth to the Jubilee and first to the next septennate.

(4) I.e., add a little from the ordinary week-day on to the holy day.

(5) Ex. XXXIV, 21.

(6) Lev. XXV, 4.

(7) Ploughing under trees in the sixth year which will benefit them in the seventh.

(8) Stuff which grows of itself and reached a third of its growth in the seventh year.

(9) As there is no ploughing, which is considered a religious duty.

(10) R. Ishmael takes the words 'in plowing time etc.' to refer to the Sabbath, and learns from them that the 'Omer to be brought on the second day of Passover may be reaped on Sabbath, v. Mak. 8b.

(11) Lev. XXIII, 32.

(12) Ibid.

(13) And after dark would be on the tenth.

(14) Lev. XXIII, 32.

(15) Dibtha, below the Tigris, S.E. of Babylon.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 9b

as if he fasted on both the ninth and the tenth days.¹

Our Rabbis taught: It is a Jubilee² — 'A Jubilee'³ even though they did not observe the release of fields, even though they did not observe the blowing of the trumpet.⁴ I might say [that it is still a Jubilee] even though they did not observe the dismissal of slaves. Therefore it says, 'it is'.⁵ So R. Judah. R. Jose said: 'It is a Jubilee', — 'A Jubilee'³ even though they did not release fields, even though they did not dismiss slaves. I might think [that it is still a Jubilee] even if they did not blow the trumpet. It therefore says, 'it is'. Now⁶ since one text brings some cases under the rule and another text excludes others from it, why should I expound: 'A Jubilee',⁷ even though they did not dismiss, but it is not a Jubilee unless they blew the trumpet'? Because it is possible that there should be no [opportunity for]⁸ dismissing slaves, but it is not possible that there should be no [opportunity for] blowing the trumpet.⁹ Another explanation is that the performance of the latter depends on the Beth din, but the performance of the former does not depend on the Beth din.¹⁰ What need is there

for the alternative explanation? — Because you might argue that it is impossible that there should not be someone in some part of the world who has not a slave to dismiss. Therefore I say that the one depends on the Beth din but the other does not depend on the Beth din.

I understand R. Jose's point of view, his reason being as he stated. But what is R. Judah's reason? — The text says, And ye shall proclaim liberty throughout the land,¹¹ and he holds that a text may be expounded in connection with the clause immediately preceding it, but not with the one before that.¹²

All authorities agree that the word *deror*¹³ means freedom. What does this tell us? — As it has been taught: The word *deror* means freedom. R. Judah said: What is the significance of the word *deror*? [The freedom of] one who dwells [medayyer] where he likes¹⁴ and can carry on trade in the whole country.

R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: The views given above are those of R. Judah and R. Jose, but the Sages say that [the neglect of] any of these three ceremonies renders the Jubilee inoperative. Their view was that a text can be expounded in connection both with the clause immediately preceding it and with the one before that and with the one that follows it.¹⁵ But it is written 'Jubilee'¹⁶ — This is to show that it must be kept even outside of Palestine. But it is written 'throughout the land'¹⁷ — This means that when liberation is carried out in the land it is carried out abroad, and when it is not carried out in the land it need not be carried out abroad.

AND FOR PLANTATION. How do we know this [from the Scripture]? — Because it is written, Three years [it shall be] uncircumcised,¹⁸ and it is written, and in the fourth year,¹⁹ and we learn that this year commences with Tishri from the analogy of the word 'year' in the text from the beginning of the year.²⁰ But why not conclude that it commences with Nisan from the analogy of the word 'year' in It is the first to you of the months of the year? — We draw an analogy to a year with which months are not mentioned from a year with which months are not mentioned, but we do not draw an analogy to a year with which months are not mentioned from a year with which months are mentioned.

Our Rabbis taught: 'If one plants or bends over²¹ or grafts a tree in the year before²² the Sabbatical year thirty days before New Year — in all three cases, [by New Year] a year has passed for him,²³ and he can preserve the growth during the seventh year. [If he does so] less than thirty days before New Year, the interval [up to New Year] does not count as a year for him and he may not preserve the growth in the Sabbatical year

(1) Because the eating and drinking on the ninth day is called in the text 'fasting'.

(2) Lev. XXV, 11.

(3) Added by Bah.

(4) The superfluous word 'Jubilee' shows that even in these cases the year is observed as a Jubilee for the abstaining from sowing etc.

(5) **וְיָרָם** This word having a limiting force.

(6) This is a continuation of R. Jose's statement.

(7) So Bah; cur. edd. 'It is a Jubilee'.

(8) Lit., 'it is possible for the world'. E.g., if no Israelite had a slave.

(9) It is hardly possible that there should be no trumpet.

(10) Because the Beth din may not be able to compel all persons to dismiss their slaves.

(11) Just before the words 'it is a Jubilee'.

(12) Hence we apply the limiting force of the words 'it is' to the dismissal of slaves, but not to the blowing of the trumpet, which does not immediately precede.

(13) In Lev. XXV, 10. E.V. 'liberty'.

- (14) [**בֵּי דִירָא** , Lit., ‘in a dwelling place’. MS.M.; **דִירָא** (carrier). As a carrier carries (or, goes round with) his load everywhere he likes].
- (15) Viz., ‘and ye shall return everyone unto his possession’.
- (16) This should cancel the limiting force of ‘it is’.
- (17) So how can you say that it should be kept outside of Palestine?
- (18) Lev. XIX, 23.
- (19) Ibid. 24.
- (20) V. supra p. 31.
- (21) A branch from a tree and plants it in the ground without separating it from the parent tree.
- (22) Lit., ‘in the eve of’.
- (23) I.e., the thirty days count as one of the years of ‘uncircumcision’.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 10a

. The fruit of such a plantation is forbidden until the fifteenth of Shebat,¹ whether as "uncircumcised" in [the year of] "uncircumcision", or as fourth year fruit in the fourth year,² What is the ground for this ruling? — R. Hiyya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan (though some trace it back to the authority of R. Jannai): Scripture says, And in the fourth year. . . and in the fifth year.³ There are occasions when fruit appears in the fourth year and it is still forbidden on account of 'uncircumcision', and there are occasions when fruit appears in the fifth year and it is still forbidden on account of 'fourth year'.

Shall I say that that is not [in agreement with] R. Meir,⁴ since R. Meir has affirmed⁵ that one day in the year is reckoned as a year, as it has been taught: ‘Par [bullock] is mentioned in the Torah without further qualification and means an animal twenty-four months and one day old. So R. Meir. R. Eleazar says, it means an animal twenty-four months and thirty days old. For R. Meir used to say: Wherever ‘egel [calf] is mentioned in the Torah without further qualification, it means of the first year; [‘egel]⁶ ben bakar [young ox] means, of the second year; par [bullock] means, of the third year’! — You may still say [it is in agreement with] R. Meir. When R. Meir said that one day in a year is counted as a year, he meant at the end of a period,⁷ but not at the beginning.⁸

Raba said: Cannot we apply here an argument a fortiori,⁹ [to wit]: Seeing that in the case of a niddah,¹⁰ though the beginning of the [seventh] day is not reckoned as concluding her period,¹¹ the end of the [first] day yet counts for the beginning of her period,¹² in the case of [a period of] years where one day is counted [as a whole year] at the end,¹³

-
- (1) Although three years are reckoned to have been completed by the previous New Year.
- (2) Tosef. Sheb. I.
- (3) Ibid. 24, 25. Stress is laid in the exposition on the word ‘and’.
- (4) The view that thirty days are required to count as a year.
- (5) Lit., ‘for if like R. Meir, surely he said’.
- (6) But par ben bakar means ‘of the third year’. V. Tosaf. s.v. **עגל**.
- (7) E.g., the three-yearly period of the par.
- (8) E.g., of the three-yearly period of ‘uncircumcision’.
- (9) To show that it makes no difference whether the day is at the beginning or the end of the period.
- (10) A menstruous woman.
- (11) Her period of uncleanness ending only at nightfall on the seventh day, and not at any hour earlier in the day.
- (12) I.e., if she begins counting in the middle of a day, as soon as nightfall arrives she is reckoned as having completed one day. [The reference here is to Niddah who according to Biblical law was allowed to cleanse herself when seven days had passed from her first menstrual flow, provided it ceased on the seventh day before sunset. This law was later replaced by the more stringent Rabbinic rule necessitating a period of seven clean days after a single blood issue.]
- (13) As in the case of the par.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 10b

does it not follow that one day should be counted [as a year] at the beginning? — What then? Will you say [that the passage quoted¹ follows] R. Eleazar? [How can this be, seeing that] R. Eleazar requires thirty days and thirty days,² as we have learnt: ‘It is not allowed to plant nor to bend over nor to graft in the year before the Sabbatical year less than thirty days before New Year, and if one did plant or bend over or graft, he must uproot the plant. So R. Eleazar. R. Judah said: If a grafting does not take within three days, it will not take at all. R. Jose and R. Simeon said that it takes two weeks’,³ and [commenting on this] R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha: On the view that thirty days are the period [for taking] we require thirty days and thirty;⁴ on the view that three days are the period, thirty-three days are required; on the view that two weeks are the period, two weeks and thirty days are required. Now even if [we accept the view of] R. Judah, thirty-three days are required? — The truth is [that the statement in question follows] R. Meir, and when it says thirty days, it means the thirty days of taking. In that case it should say thirty-one days?⁵ — He held that the thirtieth day counts both ways.

R. Johanan said: Both of them [R. Meir and R. Eleazar] based their views on the same verse, viz., And it came to pass in the one and six hundredth year, in the first month, on the first day of the month.⁶ R. Meir reasoned: Seeing that the year was only one day old and it is still called a year, we can conclude that one day in a year is reckoned as a year. What says the other to this? — [He says that] if it were written, ‘In the six hundred and first year’, then it would be as you say. Seeing, however, that it is written, ‘In the one and six hundredth year’, the word ‘year’ refers to ‘six hundred’, and as for the word ‘one’, this means ‘the beginning of one’.⁷ And what is R. Eleazar’s reason? — Because it is written, ‘In the first month on the first day of the month. Seeing that the month was only one day old and it is yet called ‘month’, we can conclude that one day in a month is reckoned as a month; and since one day in a month is reckoned as a month, thirty days in a year are reckoned as a year, a month being reckoned by its unit and a year by its unit.

(We infer from what has just been said that both [R. Meir and R. Eleazar] were of opinion that the world was created in Nisan.)⁸

It has been taught: R. Eliezer says: In Tishri the world was created; in Tishri the Patriarchs⁹ were born; in Tishri the Patriarchs died; on Passover Isaac was born; on New Year Sarah, Rachel and Hannah were visited;¹⁰ on New Year Joseph went forth from prison

(1) Where it says that less than thirty days does not count for planting etc.

(2) To elapse before a year is completed for ‘uncircumcision’ — thirty days for the ‘taking’ and thirty for the addition from the profane on to the holy (Rashi).

(3) Sheb. II, 6.

(4) To count for a year of ‘uncircumcision’. V. p. 37, n. 11.

(5) Thirty days for taking and one for the addition.

(6) Gen. VIII, 13.

(7) I.e., it merely gives the date, but gives no indication that a day can be counted as a year.

(8) Because both agree that ‘the first day of the first month’ in the text marks the beginning of another year. Rashi points out that both might equally well hold that the ‘first month’ here means Tishri, it being so called as first month to the creation and he therefore rejects this sentence. But v. Tosaf. s.v. **מזל** .

(9) Abraham and Jacob.

(10) I.e., remembered on high.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 11a

; on New Year the bondage of our ancestors in Egypt ceased;¹ in Nisan they were redeemed and in Nisan they will be redeemed in the time to come. R. Joshua says: In Nisan the world was created; in Nisan the Patriarchs were born; in Nisan the Patriarchs died; on Passover Isaac was born; on New Year Sarah, Rachel and Hannah were visited; on New Year Joseph went forth from prison; on New Year the bondage of our ancestors ceased in Egypt; and in Nisan they will be redeemed in time to come.

It has been taught: 'R. Eliezer says: Whence do we know that the world was created in Tishri? Because it says, And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herb yielding seed, and fruit-tree.² Which is the month in which the earth puts forth grass and the trees are full of fruit? You must say that this is Tishri. That time was the season of rainfall,³ and the rain came down and the plants sprouted, as it says, And a mist went up from the earth.⁴

R. Joshua says: Whence do we know that the world was created in Nisan? Because it says, And the earth brought forth grass, herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit.⁵ Which is the month in which the earth is full of grass and trees [begin to] produce fruit? You must say that this is Nisan. That time was the period when cattle, beasts and fowls copulate with one another, as it says, The rains have mounted the sheep etc.⁶ And how does the other explain the text, 'tree bearing fruit'? — This signifies a blessing for future generations. And what does the other make of the words 'fruit-tree'? — This is to be explained in accordance with the dictum of R. Joshua b. Levi; for R. Joshua b. Levi said: All creatures of the creation were brought into being with their full stature, their full capacities, and their full beauty, as it says, And the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the host of them [zeba'am]. Read not zeba'am, but zibyonam [their beauty].

R. Eliezer said: Whence do we know that the Patriarchs were born in Tishri? Because it says, And all the men of Israel assembled themselves unto King Solomon, at the feast in the month Ethanim;⁷ that is, the month in which the mighty ones [ethanim] of the world were born. How do you know that this word ethan means 'mighty'? — Because it is written, Thy dwelling-place is firm [ethan],⁸ and it also says, Hear, ye mountains, the Lord's controversy, and ye mighty rocks [ethanim] the foundations of the earth.⁹ It also says, The voice of my beloved, behold he cometh, leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills,¹⁰ [where] 'leaping upon the mountains' means, for the merit of the patriarchs, and 'skipping upon the hills' means, for the merit of the matriarchs.

R. Joshua said: Whence do we know that the patriarchs were born in Nisan? Because it says, and it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year in the month of Ziv¹¹ — that is, the month in which the brilliant ones [zewthane] of the world were born. But how does he explain the expression 'month of Ethanim'? — It means, [the month] which is strong in religious duties.¹² What does the other make of the expression 'in the month of Ziv'? — It means, the month in which there is splendour for the trees, for so Rab Judah has said: When a man goes abroad in the days of Nisan and sees trees blossoming, he should say, 'Blessed is He that hath not left His world short of anything and has created therein goodly creatures and goodly trees to rejoice mankind'.

He who holds that they were born in Nisan holds that they died in Nisan, and he who holds that they were born in Tishri holds that they died in Tishri, as it says, I am a hundred and twenty years old this day.¹³ The word 'this day' seems here superfluous. What then is the point of it? [As much as to say], This day my days and years have reached full measure, which teaches that the Holy One, blessed be He, sits and completes the years of the righteous from day to day and from month to month, as it says, The number of thy days I will fulfil.¹⁴

Whence do we know that Isaac was born on Passover? — Because it is written, On the [next] festival¹⁵ I will return unto thee.¹⁶ Now when was he [the angel] speaking?¹⁷ Shall I say [he was

speaking] on Passover and referring to Pentecost? Could she bear in fifty days?¹⁸ Shall I say then that [he was speaking on] Pentecost and was referring to Tishri? Even in five months could she bear? I must suppose then that he was speaking on Tabernacles and referring to Passover.¹⁹ Even so, could she bear in six months? — It has been taught that that year was a leap year. All the same, if the Master deducts the days of uncleanness,²⁰ the time is too short? — Mar Zutra replied: Even those who hold that when a woman bears at nine months she does not give birth before the month is complete²¹ admit that if she bears at seven months she can give birth before the month is complete, as it says, And it came to pass after the cycle of days;²² the minimum of cycles is two, and the minimum of days is two.

‘On New Year Sarah, Rachel and Hannah were visited’. Whence do we know this? — R. Eliezer said: We learn it from the two occurrences of the word ‘visiting’, and the two occurrences of the word ‘remembering’. It is written concerning Rachel, And God remembered Rachel,²³ and it is written concerning Hannah, And the Lord remembered her,²⁴ and there is an analogous mention of ‘remembering’ in connection with New Year, as it is written, a solemn rest, a remembering of the blast of the trumpet.²⁵ The double mention of visiting [is as follows]. It is written concerning Hannah, For the Lord had visited Hannah,²⁶ and it is written concerning Sarah, And the Lord visited Sarah.²⁷

‘On New Year Joseph went forth from the prison’. Whence do we know this? — Because it is written, Blow the horn on the new moon, on the covering day for our festival . . .

(1) Six months before the redemption.

(2) Gen. I, 11.

(3) Lit., ‘fructification’.

(4) Gen. II, 6. This is supposed to have been at the time of the creation, and is therefore a proof that the world was created in Tishri.

(5) Gen. I, 12. ‘Bearing fruit’ is taken to mean, ‘about to bear fruit’.

(6) Ps. LXV, 14. ‘The meadows are clothed with flocks’. This Psalm is supposed to refer to the creation.

(7) I Kings VIII, 2. The verse continues, ‘which is the seventh month’.

(8) Num. XXIV, 21.

(9) Micah VI, 2.

(10) Cant. II, 8. This verse is adduced to show that mountains’ can refer to the Patriarchs.

(11) I Kings VI, 1. The text says that this was the second month, but sometimes the Nisan tekufah (vernal equinox) is late in occurring, in which case the month of Iyar may according to solar calculation still be Nisan (Rashi).

(12) As a number of festivals occur in it.

(13) Deut. XXXI, 2.

(14) Ex. XXIII, 26.

(15) Heb. **לְמוֹעֵד** E.V. ‘at the set time’.

(16) Gen. XVIII, 14. Said by the angel to Abraham with reference to the birth of Isaac.

(17) Lit., ‘standing’.

(18) The interval between Passover and Pentecost.

(19) According to another tradition (based on the words, knead and prepare unleavened cakes), the angels appeared to Abraham on Passover. Cf. Tosaf. s.v. **סֵס**.

(20) According to tradition, Sarah became niddah (v. Glos.) on that day.

(21) Lit., ‘defective (months)’. I.e., less than twenty-nine or thirty days.

(22) I Sam. I, 20 (E.V. ‘when the time was come about’). This is taken as proof by the Talmud that Hannah bore after six months and two days.

(23) Gen. XXX, 22.

(24) I Sam. I, 19.

(25) Lev. XXIII, 24.

(26) I Sam. II, 21.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 11b

He appointed it for Joseph for a testimony when he went forth¹ etc.

‘On New Year the bondage of our ancestors ceased in Egypt’. It is written in one place, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians,² and it is written in another place, I removed his shoulder from the burden.³ ‘In Nisan they were delivered’, as Scripture recounts. ‘In Tishri they will be delivered in time to come’. This is learnt from the two occurrences of the word ‘horn’. It is written in one place, Blow the horn on the new moon,⁴ and it is written in another place, In that day a great horn shall be blown.⁵ ‘R. Joshua says, In Nisan they were delivered, in Nisan they will be delivered in the time to come’. Whence do we know this? — Scripture calls [the Passover] ‘a night of watchings’,⁶ [which means], a night which has been continuously watched for from the six days of the creation. What says the other to this? — [He says it means], a night which is under constant protection against evil spirits.⁷

R. Joshua and R. Eliezer are herein consistent [with views expressed by them elsewhere], as it has been taught: ‘In the sixth hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month.⁸ R. Joshua said: That day was the seventeenth day of Iyar, when the constellation of Pleiades sets at daybreak and the fountains begin to dry up, and because they [mankind] perverted their ways, the Holy One, blessed be He, changed for them the work of creation and made the constellation of Pleiades rise at daybreak and took two stars from the Pleiades and brought a flood on the world. R. Eliezer said: That day was the seventeenth of Marheshvan, a day on which the constellation of Pleiades rises at daybreak, and [the season] when the fountains begin to fill

(1) Ps. LXXXI, 4-6.

(2) Ex. VI, 6.

(3) Ps. LXXXI, 7 in reference to Joseph.

(4) Ibid. 4.

(5) Isa. XXVII, 13.

(6) Ex. XII, 42.

(7) I.e., on this night they are not allowed to roam as on other nights.

(8) Gen. VII, 11.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 12a

, and because they perverted their ways, the Holy One, blessed be He, changed for them the work of creation, and caused the constellation of Pleiades to rise at daybreak and took away two stars [from it] and brought a flood on the world’.¹ Now accepting the view of R. Joshua, we can understand why the word ‘second’ is used;² but on R. Eliezer's view, what is meant by ‘second’? — [It means], the second to [the day of] judgment.³ Again, on R. Joshua's view we see what change there was in the work of creation; but on R. Eliezer's view what change was there?⁴ — The answer is found in the dictum of R. Hisda; for R. Hisda said: With hot liquid they sinned and with hot liquid they were punished. ‘With hot liquid they sinned’, namely, in [sexual] transgression. ‘With hot liquid they were punished’: it is written here⁵ , and the waters assuaged,⁶ and it is written elsewhere, and the wrath of the king was assuaged.⁷

Our Rabbis taught: ‘The wise men of Israel follow R. Eliezer in dating the Flood⁸ and R. Joshua in dating the annual cycles,⁹ while the scholars of other peoples follow R. Joshua in dating the Flood also’.

AND FOR VEGETABLES. A Tanna taught: 'For vegetables and for tithes and for vows'. What is meant by vegetables? The tithe of vegetables? But this is the same as 'tithes'? — [The Tanna] mentions first a tithe prescribed by the Rabbis and then those prescribed by the Torah.¹⁰ But let him mention those prescribed by the Torah first? — Since he was specially pleased with the others,¹¹ he mentions them first. And our Tanna [— why does he not mention tithes]? — He mentions a tithe prescribed by the Rabbis,¹² and [leaves us to infer] a fortiori those prescribed by the Torah. Why does not the Tanna here say simply 'tithe' [in the singular]? — He desires to include both the tithe of cattle and the tithe of cereals. Then why does he not say 'vegetable' [in the singular]? — He refers to two kinds of vegetables, as we have learnt: '[Tithe is to be given from] vegetables which are commonly made up into bundles, from the time they are so made up, and from those which are not commonly so made up, from the time when he fills a vessel with them.

Our Rabbis taught: If one¹³ gathered herbs on the eve of New Year before sunset, and then gathered some more

(1) There seems to be some confusion in the text here. To make it astronomically correct we should read (with the Seder Olam) in the dictum of R. Joshua, 'When Pleiades rises at daybreak', and in the dictum of R. Eliezer, 'sets at daybreak'.

(2) Because we find Nisan called the first month in the Torah.

(3) Which is also recognized by Scripture as the beginning of a year in the text, 'The eyes of the Lord are upon it (the Land of Israel) from the beginning of the year'.

(4) Seeing that it was the season of rain.

(5) In connection with the Flood.

(6) Gen. VIII, 1.

(7) Esth. VII, 10.

(8) I.e., the years of Noah and the calendar from Tishri; Tishri being the New Year for years.

(9) They hold that the world was created in Nisan, v. supra p. 30, n. 5.

(10) Tithes for all other kinds of produce apart from vegetables are derived by the Rabbis from biblical texts. But v. Tosaf. s.v. תנא .

(11) Because they were a rabbinic innovation.

(12) I.e., tithes for vegetables.

(13) Apparently a non-Jew is meant (Tosaf.).

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 12b

after sunset, terumah¹ and tithe are not given from one lot for another, because terumah and tithe are not given from the new for the old nor from the old for the new. If it was at the meeting point of the second and third years² [of the septennial cycle], from that [which is plucked in] the second year first and second tithe³ [have to be given], [and from that which was plucked in] the third year, first tithe and the tithe of the poor.

Whence this rule? — R. Joshua b. Levi says: [It is written], When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithe of thine increase in the third year, which is the year of the tithe.⁴ This means the year in which there is only one tithe.⁵ How is then one to act? [He gives] the first tithe and the tithe of the poor, and the second tithe is omitted. Is this correct, or should the first tithe also be omitted? — [Not so], because it says, Moreover thou shalt speak unto the Levites and say unto them, When ye take of the children of Israel the tithe which I have given you from them for your inheritance.⁶ The text here compares the tithe [of the Levites] to an inheritance, [to signify that] just as an inheritance is to be held uninterrupted, so their tithe is to be given without interruption. It has been taught to the same effect: 'When thou hast made an end of tithing etc.' [This means] a year in which there is only one tithe. How is one to act? [He gives] first tithe and tithe of the poor, and the second tithe is omitted. Should perhaps the first tithe also be omitted? — [Not so], because it says, and the Levite shall come,⁷ which means to say, every time he comes give him.⁸ So R. Judah. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says:

We have no need [to appeal to this text].⁹ It says, Moreover thou shalt speak unto the Levites and say unto them, When ye take from the children of Israel the tithe which I have given you from them for your inheritance.¹⁰ The text here compares the tithe to an inheritance, to signify that just as an inheritance is held uninterruptedly, so the tithe is to be given without interruption.

AND FOR VOWS. Our Rabbis taught: If one is interdicted by vow to have no benefit from another person for a year, he reckons twelve months from day to day. If he said 'for this year', then even if he made the vow on the twenty-ninth of Elul, as soon as the first of Tishri arrives a year is completed for him; and this even on the view of those who say that one day in a year is not counted as a year. For he undertook to mortify himself, and he has mortified himself. But why not say [that his year ends in] Nisan? — In respect of vows, follow the ordinary use of language.¹¹

We have learnt elsewhere: 'Fenugrec¹² [becomes liable to tithe] from the time when it grows;¹³ produce¹⁴ and olives, from the time when they have grown a third'. What is meant by 'from the time when it grows'? — From the time when it grows sufficiently for resowing.¹⁵ 'Produce and olives from the time when they are a third grown'. Whence this rule? — R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan (some trace it back to the name of R. Jose the Galilean): Scripture says: At the end of every seven years, in the set time of the year of release, in the feast of Tabernacles.¹⁶ Now how comes the year of release to be mentioned here? The feast of Tabernacles is already the eighth year? It is in fact to intimate to us that if produce has grown a third in the seventh year before New Year, the rules of the seventh year are to be applied to it in the eighth year.¹⁷

Said R. Zera to R. Assi:

(1) V. Glos.

(2) Lit., 'if the second entered into the third'. In the second year a tithe was taken to Jerusalem to be consumed there; in the third year a tithe was given to the poor, but not taken to Jerusalem. The first tithe which went to the Levites was given every year. v. infra.

(3) I.e., tithe of the Levites and tithe for Jerusalem.

(4) Deut. XXVI, 12.

(5) I.e., one of the two regular tithes.

(6) Num. XVIII, 26.

(7) Deut. XIV, 29.

(8) In the third year also.

(9) R. Eliezer apparently was not completely satisfied with the proof from this text, because it speaks of the Levite as in the category of the poor.

(10) Num. XVIII, 26.

(11) And men ordinarily talk of the year as beginning in Tishri.

(12) Or 'fenugreek', a leguminous plant allied to clover.

(13) I.e., its year is determined by the time of its growth and not of its gathering, as in the case of vegetables.

(14) התבואה It is a question whether this includes grapes or not. V. Tosaf.

(15) Cf. Tosaf. s.v. משתצמח .

(16) Deut. XXXI, 10.

(17) Tosaf. (s.v. מנהג) points out that this would seem to come under the rule already given above of adding from the profane on to the holy, and answers that from this verse we should learn only that the produce if harvested must be treated as seventh-year produce e.g.. in respect of trading interest, but not that it is forbidden to harvest it.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 13a

But perhaps even though it has not begun to ripen at all, the All-Merciful has still laid down that it is to be left alone until the feast of Tabernacles? — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written, and the feast of ingathering [asif] at the end of the year.¹ Now what is 'ingathering'? Shall I say it means

the feast which comes at the time of ingathering? This is already signified in the words when thou gatherest in.² What then must be meant here by asif? Harvesting;³ and the Rabbis take it for granted that all produce which is harvested by Tabernacles must have grown to a third by New Year, and Scripture applies to it the words at the end of the year.⁴ Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zera: And were the Rabbis certain that there is this distinction between a third and less than a third?⁵ He replied to him: Am I not always telling you not to let yourself go beyond the established rule? All the measurements laid down by the Sages are of this nature. In forty se'ahs [of water] a ritual bath may be taken; in forty se'ahs less a kurtub⁶ it may not be taken. [A quantity of food equal to the] size of an egg can be rendered unclean as foodstuff; if it is short of that quantity by a grain it cannot be rendered unclean. [A piece of cloth] three handbreadths by three can be rendered unclean by being trodden on,⁷ less than this quantity by one hair is not so rendered unclean. R. Jeremiah subsequently said: What I said is of no account. For R. Kahana was asked by members of the college, Whence did the Israelites bring the omer which they offered on their entry into the Land [of Israel]? If you say, it grew⁸ while still in the possession of the heathen, [this cannot be, since] the All Merciful prescribed your harvest⁹ and not the harvest of the stranger. (But how do we know that they [the Israelites] offered it at all? Perhaps they did not offer it at all? — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written, And they did eat of the produce of the land on the morrow after the Passover.¹⁰ On the morrow after the Passover they ate, but not before, [which shows that] they brought the omer and only then ate. Whence then did they obtain it?) — He [R. Kahana] replied to them: All that had not grown to a third while in the possession of the stranger [was fitting for their use]. Now [it might be argued here also that] perhaps it had grown [in the possession of the stranger] and they were not certain. The fact, however, [that they ate it] shows that they were certain. So here,¹¹ the Rabbis are certain. But perhaps [the Israelites brought the omer from] corn which had not commenced to grow [when they entered the land], but where it had grown to a quarter they were not certain about the difference between a third and less than a third?¹² — Do not imagine such a thing. For it is written, And the people went up from the Jordan on the tenth of the month.¹³ Now if you assume that by then the corn had not grown at all, could it become ripe in five days? But [on your assumption] that it had grown to a fourth or a fifth, could [such corn] become ripe in five days? What you consequently have to answer [even on this assumption] is that the land of Canaan is called 'the land of the hind';¹⁴ so [on the other assumption] you can answer that it is called 'the land of the hind'.

R. Hanina objected strongly to the statement made above. Can you, he said, maintain that this 'asif' is 'harvesting', seeing that it is written, when thou gatherest in from thy threshing floor and from thy wine press,¹⁵ and [commenting on this] a Master has said, The verse speaks of the waste of the threshing floor and the wine press?¹⁶ Said R. Zera: I thought I was sure of this,¹⁷ and now R. Hanina has come and put a spoke in my wheel.¹⁸ How then do we know [this rule about a third]? — As it has been taught: R. Jonathan b. Joseph says: And it shall bring forth produce for the three years;¹⁹

(1) Ex. XXIII, 16.

(2) Ibid.

(3) The verse meaning that the harvest gathered in at this season belongs to the year going out.

(4) Which shows that it is regarded as belonging to the year which is going out.

(5) Viz., that what is grown to a third belongs to one year, and what is less grown to another year. This seems to R. Jeremiah rather arbitrary.

(6) A small liquid measure equal to 1/64 of a log.

(7) By one who had a flux.

(8) A third (Rashi).

(9) Ye shall bring the sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest. Lev. XXIII, 10.

(10) Josh. V, 11.

(11) With reference to the corn that is harvested at the season of Tabernacles.

(12) And it was not from such corn that they brought the omer.

(13) Josh. IV, 19.

(14) Dan. XI, 16 (E.V. beautiful land). The Sages say that the Land of Israel is compared to a hind on account of its swiftness in bringing its products to maturity. Keth. 112.

(15) Deut. XVI, 13. 'From' is taken in the partitive sense.

(16) To show that it may be used for covering the sukkah; and the phrase, Festival of 'asif' ('ingathering') here too has the same signification — the festival that comes at the time when people 'gather in' the waste products for the sukkah.

(17) Lit., 'this thing was in our hand'.

(18) Lit., 'has thrown into it an axe'.

(19) Lev. XXV, 21.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 13b

read not lishlosh [for three], but lishlish [to a third].¹ But this text is required for its literal meaning?² It is written in another verse, And ye shall sow for the eighth year and eat of the produce, the old store, until the ninth year.³

We have learnt elsewhere:⁴ 'Rice, millet, hanie⁵ and sesame,⁶ if they have taken root by New Year, are for purposes of tithe counted⁷ as belonging to the year before [the New Year],⁸ and are permitted in the seventh year.⁹ Otherwise they are forbidden in the seventh year,⁹ and are reckoned for tithe as belonging to the next year.¹⁰ Rabbah said: The Rabbis have laid down that [the tithe year of] a tree is determined by its blossoming, that of produce and olives by their becoming a third grown, that of vegetables by their ingathering. In which class have these been placed by the Rabbis? — Rabbah answered himself by saying: Since they are gathered for shelling as required,¹¹ the Rabbis made the taking root the determining factor.¹²

Said Abaye to him: Can he not collect the whole crop in a heap,¹³ so that ex post facto he will have set aside from the new crop in it for the new crop in it, and from the old crop in it for the old crop?¹⁴ Has it not been taught:¹⁵ 'R. Jose b. Kippar says in the name of R. Simeon Shezuri: If Egyptian beans have been sown for seed and part takes root before New Year and part after, terumah and tithe must not be given from one lot for another, because terumah and tithe are not given from the new for the old nor from the old for the new. How then is one to manage? He collects the whole crop in a heap, so that in the end he gives terumah and tithe from the new crop in the heap for the new crop in the heap, and from the old crop in the heap for the old crop in the heap! — He replied to him: You cite R. Simeon Shezuri. R. Simeon Shezuri held that mixing can be relied on,¹⁶ whereas the Rabbis held that mixing cannot be relied on.

R. Isaac b. Nahmani said in the name of Samuel: The halachah follows the ruling given by R. Jose b. Kippar in the name of R. Simeon Shezuri. R. Zera strongly demurred to this. Did Samuel, he asked, really say this? Has not Samuel said: Mixing is not relied on for anything save wine and oil? — R. Zera overlooked the following dictum of Samuel: The determining factor is in all cases the full ripening.¹⁷

(1) Meaning that it is considered ripe when it has grown a third.

(2) And how therefore can you use it for a deduction?

(3) Ibid. 22. This shows that the produce of the sixth year will last three years, and therefore the other verse is not required to tell us this and may be used for a deduction.

(4) Sheb. II, 7.

(5) A species of millet.

(6) These are all counted as varieties of pulse.

(7) In an ordinary year.

(8) Second or third as the case may be. V. p. 44, n. 6.

(9) Viz., those that take root in the sixth.

(10) V. Sheb. II, 7.

(11) I.e., some before New Year and some after. [The phrase עשויין פרכין פרכין is difficult. Rashi renders: They (their gathering) are made (as they are needed) for shelling. R. Hananel reads פרגין ('beds') and renders, They ripen (at different times) in different beds, even though they may 'take' at the same time].

(12) Because otherwise it would be difficult to keep the old and the new separate for tithing purposes without great inconvenience.

(13) Lit., 'heap up his threshing-floor in the middle of it'.

(14) Abaye holds that if the whole crops old and new, is well mixed together, then when he sets aside terumah and tithe from it, the proportion of old and new in the terumah and tithe will be the same as the proportion of old and new in the whole crop.

(15) Tosef. Sheb. II.

(16) To produce old and new in proper proportions in the tithe. Lit., 'there is mixing'.

(17) And therefore in fact tithe is given from Egyptian beans all together, whether they took root in the outgoing or in the incoming year, which is as R. Simeon Shezuri said, in so far that the two crops can be tithed together, although according to each for a different reason. For on the view of Samuel the whole is regarded as belonging to the incoming year, which is not what R. Simeon said.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 14a

And all three dicta of Samuel are necessary.¹ For if he had told us only that the law follows R. Simeon b. Shezuri, I should have said that his reason was because we can rely on mixing; he tells us therefore that mixing is not to be relied on for anything. And if he had told us that mixing is not to be relied on for anything, I should have said that he holds with the Rabbis;² therefore he tells us that the halachah follows R. Simeon Shezuri. If again we had only these two dicta, I should have said that Samuel contradicts himself;³ he therefore tells us that the determining factor is in all cases the full ripening.⁴ And if he had told us [only] that the determining factor is in all cases the full ripening, I should have said that this applies also to produce and olives. Therefore he tells us that the halachah follows R. Simeon Shezuri where he expresses a different view.⁵ [But if so], let him indicate [only] these two points; why does he tell us that mixing is not in all cases to be relied on? — His object is to tell us that for wine and oil mixing is to be relied on.

It has been taught: R. Jose the Galilean says: After that thou hast gathered in from thy threshing-floor and from thy wine press:⁶ [this tells us that] just as the [produce brought to the] threshing floor and the wine press have this special feature, that they are nurtured by the waters⁷ of the outgoing year and are [consequently] tithed for the outgoing year, so all products which are nurtured by the waters of the outgoing year are tithed for the outgoing year. This excludes vegetables, which are nurtured by the waters of the current year⁸ and are [consequently] tithed for the current year. R. Akiba said: 'After that thou hast gathered it, from thy threshing-floor and thy wine press:' just as [the products brought to the] threshing-floor and wine press have this special feature that they are nurtured by rain water⁹ and [consequently] are tithed for the outgoing year, so all products that are nurtured by rain water are tithed for the outgoing year. This excludes vegetables, which are nurtured by all kinds of water¹⁰ and are consequently tithed for the current year. Where do they [R. Jose and R. Akiba] differ in practice? — R. Abbahu said: They take different views with regard to seedless onions and Egyptian beans, as we have learnt:¹¹ Seedless onions and Egyptian beans which have been kept without water for thirty days before New Year [and are gathered after New Year] are tithed for the outgoing year and are permitted in the Sabbatical year. Otherwise they are forbidden in the Sabbatical year and are tithed for the current year.¹²

ON THE FIRST OF SHEBAT IS NEW YEAR FOR TREES. What is the reason? — R. Eleazar said in the name of R. Oshaia: Because [by then] the greater part of the year's rain has fallen¹³ and the greater part of the cycle¹⁴ is still to come. What is the sense of this? What it means is this: 'Although the greater part of the cycle is still to come, yet since the greater part of the year's rain has

fallen, [therefore etc.]’.

Our Rabbis taught: ‘It is recorded of R. Akiba that he once plucked a citron tree on the first of Shebat and gave two tithes from

-
- (1) For making clear to us his point of view.
 - (2) So that if old and new have become mixed together, tithe for both parts of the mixture must proportionately be given from some other quarter.
 - (3) By saying on the one hand that the law follows R. Simeon, which would imply that mixing can be relied on, and on the other that mixing cannot be relied on.
 - (4) And this is the reason why the law follows R. Simeon.
 - (5) From the Rabbis. That is, only in the case of beans etc. but not of produce, where Samuel would hold that the decisive factor is the growth of a third. [R. Hananel reads ‘where they (R. Simeon b. Shezuri and the Rabbis) differ’].
 - (6) Deut. XVI, 13.
 - (7) This apparently includes both rain water and irrigation.
 - (8) Lit., ‘the year that covers’. The year in which they are gathered.
 - (9) Lit., ‘most (kinds of) water’.
 - (10) Including irrigation.
 - (11) Sheb. II, 9.
 - (12) Rashi gives two views as to what is implied in this. According to one opinion, if these vegetables have been kept without water for the last thirty days of the outgoing year, then R. Jose would hold that they must have been nurtured by the rain water of that year, and so are to be tithed for that year; whereas R. Akiba would hold that their growth is due in part to irrigation. and so they would be tithed for the next year; and the Mishnah quoted follows R. Jose. The other opinion is that as they have not been irrigated for thirty days, it is R. Akiba and not R. Jose who would hold that they have been nurtured by the rain of the outgoing year, and the Mishnah therefore follows R. Akiba. It was customary to withhold water from these two species for thirty days before plucking them so as to harden them.
 - (13) And the trees now begin to blossom.
 - (14) The cycle of Tebeth; i.e., the winter season beginning at the winter solstice. V. supra p. 30, n. 5.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 14b

it,¹ one² in accordance with the ruling of Beth Shammai and one³ in accordance with the ruling of Beth Hillel.⁴ R. Jose b. Judah said: He did not follow the [two] rulings of Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel, but the [two] rulings of Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer, as we have learnt:⁵ ‘A citron tree follows the rule of a tree in three respects and of a vegetable in one respect. It follows the rule of a tree in three respects — for ‘uncircumcision,’⁶ for fourth-year fruit, and for the Sabbatical year. It follows the rule of a vegetable in one respect, its tithe [year] being determined by its plucking. So Rabban Gamaliel. R. Eliezer, however, says that a citron follows the rule of a tree in all respects.’⁷

But is it right to adopt the harder rule from both sides?⁸ Has it not been taught: ‘As a general principle, the halachah follows Beth Hillel. If one prefers, however, to adopt the rule of Beth Shammai, he may do so, and if he desires to adopt the rule of Beth Hillel he may do so. One, however, who adopts the more lenient rulings of both Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel [on the same subject] is a bad man, while to one who adopts the more stringent rulings of both Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel may be applied the verse, But the fool walketh in darkness.’⁹ No; either one must follow Beth Shammai both where they are more severe and more lenient or Beth Hillel both where they are more severe and more lenient? — [The answer is that] R. Akiba was doubtful about the tradition, and did not know whether Beth Hillel fixed [the New Year for trees] on the first of Shebat or on the fifteenth of Shebat.¹⁰

‘R. Jose b. Judah said: He did not adopt the two rulings of Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel, but of Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer [But would R. Jose hold that] in respect of the first of Shebat he

adopted the ruling of Beth Shammai?¹¹ — R. Hanina (or some say R. Hananiah) said: The case here is one of a citron which had blossomed before the fifteenth of Shebat of the previous year,¹² and R. Akiba might equally well have done the same thing at all earlier date,¹³ but this happened to be the actual date. Rabina said: Combine¹⁴ the two statements. It was not the first of Shebat but the fifteenth of Shebat,¹⁵ and he [R. Akiba] did not adopt the two rulings of Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel but of Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer.

Rabbah son of R. Huna said: Seeing that Rabban Gamaliel has said that the tithe year of a citron tree is determined by its plucking like that of a vegetable, its New Year [like that of a vegetable] must be the first of Tishri. The following was cited in objection to this: 'R. Simeon b. Eleazar says: If a man plucked the fruit of a citron tree on the eve of the fifteenth of Shebat before sunset, and then plucked some more after sunset, terumah and tithe must not be given from one lot for the other because terumah and tithe are not given from the new for the old nor from the old for the new. [If it was at the meeting point of the third and] fourth years, [from the fruit of] the third year he gives first tithe and the tithe of the poor, and from the fruit of the fourth year the first tithe and the second tithe'.¹⁶

-
- (1) The second tithe for the second year and the poor tithe for the third.
 - (2) The poor tithe.
 - (3) The second tithe.
 - (4) Who say that the New Year begins only on the fifteenth of Shebat.
 - (5) Bek. II, 6.
 - (6) 'Orlah, v. Glos.
 - (7) And its tithe-year is determined by its blossoming. Being in doubt whether to follow R. Gamaliel or R. Eliezer, R. Akiba gave two tithes.
 - (8) Where two authorities give each two rulings with regard to a certain subject, one being more stringent in respect of one point and the other in respect of the other. For instance, Beth Shammai rule that the lack of one vertebra in a human spine still leaves it capable of defiling by 'overshadowing' (v. Glos. s.v. ohel) but does not make an animal trefa (v. Glos.) whereas Beth Hillel says that it makes an animal trefa but leaves it incapable of defiling by overshadowing. Here Beth Shammai are more stringent in the matter of defilement and Beth Hillel in the matter of trefa (v. 'Er. 6b). So here, R. Akiba took on himself two burdens when one would have sufficed.
 - (9) Eccl. II, 14.
 - (10) And he followed Beth Hillel only.
 - (11) [For according to Beth Hillel, even if the tithe is determined by the blossoming he would still not be liable to the tithe of third year, which would not begin before the fifteenth of Shebat.]
 - (12) When the third year began, and the fruit had been left on the tree. A citron can remain on the tree for several years.
 - (13) R. Akiba following Beth Hillel and the two rulings of R. Gamaliel and R. Eliezer, the blossoming having taken place in the second year.
 - (14) In R. Jose's statement.
 - (15) When unquestionably a New Year would have commenced for trees.
 - (16) Tosef., R.H.I., cf. supra p. 44, nn. 6-7.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 15a

Now which authority is reported to make plucking the determining factor? Rabban Gamaliel; and he says here Shebat?¹ — The statement should have been reported differently,² [thus]: Rabbah b. bar Huna said: Although Rabban Gamaliel said that [the tithe-year of] a citron tree is determined by its plucking like [that of] a vegetable, yet its New Year is Shebat.

Why in the former statement³ is the expression used, 'if it was the meeting point of the second and third years', and in this statement the expression, 'if it was the meeting point of the third and fourth years'? — This points out to us incidentally that the citron tree suffers from being handled, and since

everybody handles it in the seventh year,⁴ it does not yield fruit till the third year [after blossoming].

R. Johanan inquired of R. Jannai: When is the New Year of the citron tree? — He replied: In Shebat. Do you mean [he asked further] Shebat of the calendar⁵ or Shebat of the cycle?⁶ — He replied: Shebat of the calendar.⁷

Raba inquired of R. Nahman (or, according to others, R. Johanan inquired of R. Jannai): Suppose it was a leap year, what is the rule?⁸ — He replied: Do as in ordinary years.⁹

Rabbah said: A citron tree which has blossomed in the sixth year and ripened in the seventh¹⁰ is not liable to tithe and not liable to clearance;¹¹ while one which has blossomed in the seventh year and produced fruit in the eighth is not liable to tithe but is liable to clearance. Said Abaye to him: Your second clause is unobjectionable, because [you can say that] you take the more stringent view.¹² But your first clause [surely involves a contradiction]? [For you say], 'It is not liable to clearance'. Why so? Because we say, Make the blossoming the determining factor.¹³ But if so, it should surely be liable to tithe? — He replied to him: Everybody handles it, and you say it should be liable to tithe! R. Hamnunah, however, said: A citron tree which blossoms in the sixth year and ripens in the seventh is always reckoned as belonging to the sixth, and one which blossoms in the seventh and ripens in the eighth is always regarded as belonging to the seventh. The following was cited in objection: 'R. Simeon b. Judah said in the name of R. Simeon: A citron tree which blossoms in the sixth year and ripens in the seventh is not liable to tithe and not liable to clearance, since no fruit is liable to tithe which has not both grown and been plucked in a period of liability.¹⁴ A citron tree which blossoms in the seventh year and ripens in the eighth year is not liable either to tithe or to clearance, since no fruit is liable to clearance which has not both grown and been plucked in the seventh year'. Now the first part of this statement seems to contradict R. Hamnunah,¹⁵ and the second part both Rabbah and R. Hamnunah?¹⁶ — There is a difference of Tannaim on this point,¹⁷ as it has been taught: 'R. Jose said: Abtolmus testified in the name of five elders that a citron is determined by its plucking in the matter of tithe. Our teachers, however, took a vote in Usha and decided that it is determined by its plucking for purposes both of tithe and of Sabbatical year'. How does Sabbatical year come to be mentioned here? —

(1) And not Tishri.

(2) Lit., 'if the statement was made it was stated thus'.

(3) In the Tosef. quoted on 12a ad fin.

(4) Since, like all other trees, it is common property in that year.

(5) I.e., the lunar month Shebat-thirty days from the first of Tebeth.

(6) Thirty days from the cycle of Tebeth (Winter Solstice, usually Dec. 22).

(7) In spite of the fact that fructification is due to the action of the sun.

(8) Do we make the New Year in Shebat which comes next to Tebeth, or in First Adar which takes the place of Shebat in this year?

(9) Lit., 'follow most of the years'. I.e., adhere to Shebat.

(10) Lit., 'the daughter of the sixth which enters into the seventh'.

(11) In the third and sixth years of the Septennate. V. Deut. XXVI, 13.

(12) I.e., the view which is more stringent in this case, viz., that we go by the blossoming and not by the plucking. And since we do this for purposes of clearance, we also do it for purposes of tithes, although this means taking the more lenient view. (V. Tosaf s.v. **בשלא**).

(13) And so it belongs to the sixth year.

(14) And the seventh year is not a period of liability for tithe.

(15) Who holds that if it blossoms in the sixth it is liable to tithe.

(16) Who both hold that if it blossomed in the seventh year it is liable to clearance.

(17) As to whether we go by the plucking or the blossoming for purposes of the Sabbatical year.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 15b

There is an omission in the statement, which should read as follows: '[Abtolmus testified that] a citron tree is determined by its plucking for purposes of tithe and by its blossoming for purposes of the Sabbatical year.¹ Our teachers, however, took a vote in Usha and decided that it is determined by its plucking for purposes both of tithe and of Sabbatical year'.

It has been stated: R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both lay down that a citron tree which blossoms in the sixth year and ripens in the seventh year is always reckoned as belonging to the sixth year.² When Rabin came [from Palestine], he said in the name of R. Johanan: A citron which blossomed in the sixth year and ripened in the seventh, even though [at the beginning of the seventh] it was no bigger than an olive and it subsequently became as big as a loaf, can render one guilty of breaking the rule of *tebel*.³

Our Rabbis taught: If the fruit of a tree blossoms before the fifteenth of Shebat, it is tithed for the outgoing year; if after the fifteenth of Shebat, it is tithed for the incoming year. R. Nehemiah said: This rule applies only to trees which produce two broods in a year.⁴ (Two broods,⁵ do you say? — He should say, as it were two broods).⁶ Trees, however, which produce only one brood, like date trees, carob trees and olive trees, even though they blossom before the fifteenth of Shebat are tithed for the incoming year.

R. Johanan said: In regard to carob trees, it has become the general custom to follow the rule of R. Nehemiah. Resh Lakish sought to confute R. Johanan from the following: 'As regards wild fig-trees, their seventh year is the second year [of the Septennate] because [after blossoming] their fruit takes three years to grow'.⁷ — He made no answer.⁸ Said R. Abba the priest to R. Jose: Why did he make no answer? He could have said to him, I give the view of R. Nehemiah, and you bring against me the view of the Rabbis! — [He could not have answered him thus], because Resh Lakish could have retorted: Do you abandon the Rabbis and follow R. Nehemiah? — But he could have said to him, I speak to you of the general custom, and you speak to me of a prohibition?⁹ — [He could not answer thus], because he could have said to him: Where a prohibition applies, even if there is a general custom, do we allow it? — But he could have said to him: I speak to you of the tithe of carobs, which is Rabbinical, and you speak to me of the Sabbatical year, which is Pentateuchal! — The truth is, said R. Abba the priest, I wonder whether Resh Lakish put this question. Whether he put this question? But we are distinctly told that he did so! — What R. Abba should say is, whether he [R. Johanan] admitted the difficulty or not.¹⁰

(1) And this is the view taken by Rabbah and R. Hamnurah in respect of the law of clearance. For the purposes of tithes, however, Rabbah is of the opinion that although Abtolmus makes the plucking the decisive factor, he would nevertheless exempt from tithe a citron tree which blossomed in the sixth year and ripened in the seventh, for the reason that it is handled by everybody (Rashi)].

(2) Whether for purposes of the Sabbatical year or tithes.

(3) V. Glos. If it was consumed before tithe was given for it, R. Johanan being of the opinion that we go by the blossoming.

(4) R. Nehemiah's statement is here interrupted while the use of the strange word 'broods' is explained.

(5) Heb. **בְּרִיכוֹת**, a word strictly applicable only to broods of birds.

(6) I.e., their fruit is not all gathered at one time; e.g., figs; cf. supra 13b, the rule in the case of beans.

(7) Sheb. V, 1. Which would show that the blossoming is the determining factor in all trees, even those which are all plucked at one time.

(8) Lit. 'he was silenced'.

(9) The prohibition to determine the year by the plucking.

(10) I.e., whether his silence was due to the fact that he had no answer, or to the fact that he thought it obvious that tithe of carobs, which is Rabbinical, could not be put on the same footing as produce of the Sabbatical year which is

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 16a

MISHNAH. AT FOUR SEASONS [DIVINE] JUDGMENT IS PASSED ON THE WORLD:¹ AT PASSOVER IN RESPECT OF PRODUCE; AT PENTECOST IN RESPECT OF FRUIT; AT NEW YEAR ALL CREATURES PASS BEFORE HIM [GOD] LIKE CHILDREN OF MARON,² AS IT SAYS, 'HE THAT FASHIONETH THE HEART OF THEM ALL, THAT CONSIDERETH ALL THEIR DOINGS';³ **AND ON TABERNACLES JUDGMENT IS PASSED IN RESPECT OF RAIN.**

GEMARA. Which produce is referred to? Shall I say, the produce which is already grown?⁴ If so, then when were the hardships decreed which it has already suffered? It must be then the produce which is to be sown later.⁵ You assume then that only one judgment is passed. But it has been taught: 'If some calamity or misfortune⁶ happens to produce before Passover, it is in virtue of a judgment passed on the previous Passover, if after Passover, of a judgment passed at the Passover which has just gone.⁷ If a calamity or misfortune happens to a man before the Day of Atonement, it is in virtue of a judgment passed on the last Day of Atonement, if just after the Day of Atonement, of a judgment passed on the one just gone'! — Raba replied: This shows that two judgments are passed on the produce.⁸ Abaye remarked: Therefore if a man sees that the slow-maturing seed⁹ is doing well he should sow the quick-maturing seed¹⁰ in good time, so that it may be well grown before the time comes to judge it.¹¹

Our Mishnah seems to agree neither with R. Meir nor with R. Judah nor with R. Jose nor with R. Nathan. For it has been taught: 'All are judged¹² on New Year and their doom is sealed on the Day or Atonement. So R. Meir. R. Judah says: All are judged on New Year and the separate dooms are sealed each in its time — on Passover in respect of produce, on Pentecost in respect of fruit, on Tabernacles judgment is passed in respect of rain, and man is judged on New Year and his doom is sealed on the Day of Atonement. R. Jose says: Man is judged every day, as it says, And thou dost visit him every morning.¹³ R. Nathan says: Man is judged every moment, as it says, Thou dost try him every moment'.¹⁴ Should you maintain that it is after all in accordance with Rabbi Judah, [the seasons] mentioned in our Mishnah referring to the final doom, we may retort that if so there is a difficulty with the case of man!¹⁵ — Raba replied: This Tanna [of our Mishnah] follows the Tanna of the school of R. Ishmael, since it has been taught in the school of R. Ishmael: 'At four seasons judgment is passed on the world, on Passover in respect of produce, on Pentecost in respect of fruit, on Tabernacles judgment is passed in respect of rain, and man is judged on New Year and his doom is sealed on the Day of Atonement'. The statements of the Mishnah must then be taken to refer to the preliminary judgment.

R. Hisda said: What is the reason of R. Jose? — [How can you ask this?] Surely it is as he has stated, [viz., the text], 'And thou dost visit him every morning'! — What we mean is this: What is his reason for not taking the same view as R. Nathan? — 'Trying' merely means scrutinizing. But 'visiting' also merely means scrutinizing? The truth is, said R. Hisda, that R. Jose's reason is to be found in this text: To do the judgement of his servant and the judgement of his people Israel, as every day shall require.¹⁶

R. Hisda further said: If a king and a people present themselves together, the king stands his trial first, as it says, To do the judgement of his servant and the judgement of his people Israel.¹⁶ What is the reason? — If you like, I can say, because it is not proper that a king should remain outside, or if you like I can say, [so that he may be judged] before the [divine] anger waxes hot.¹⁷

R. Joseph said: Whose authority do we follow nowadays in praying [daily] for the sick and for the ailing?¹⁸ — Whose authority? That of R. Jose.¹⁹ Or if you like I can say that it is after all that of the

Rabbis,²⁰ but that at the same time we follow the counsel of R. Isaac. For R. Isaac said: Supplication²¹ is good for a man whether before the doom is pronounced or after it is pronounced.²²

It has been taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Akiba: Why did the Torah enjoin on us to offer an 'Omer on Passover? Because Passover is the season of produce. Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, said, Bring before Me an 'Omer' on Passover so that your produce in the fields may be blessed.²³ Why did the Torah enjoin on us to bring two loaves on Pentecost? Because Pentecost is the season for fruit of the tree. Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, said: Bring before Me two loaves on Pentecost so that the fruit of your trees may be blessed.²⁴ Why did the Torah enjoin on us to pour out water on Tabernacles?²⁵ The Holy One, blessed be He, said, Pour out water before Me on Tabernacles, so that your rains this year may be blessed. Also recite before Me on New Year [texts making mention of] kingship, remembrance, and the shofar-kingship, so that you may proclaim Me king over you; remembrance, so that your remembrance may rise favourably before Me; and through what? Through the shofar.²⁶

R. Abbahu said: Why do we blow on a ram's horn? The Holy One, blessed be He, said: Sound before Me a ram's horn so that I may remember on your behalf the binding of Isaac the son of

Abraham,²⁷ and account it to you as if you had bound yourselves before Me.

R. Isaac said: Why do we sound the horn on New Year? — [You ask], why do we sound? The All-Merciful has told us to sound!²⁸ — What he means is, why do we sound a teru'ah?²⁹ [You ask] why do we sound a teru'ah? The All-Merciful has proclaimed 'a memorial of teru'ah!³⁰ — What he means is, why do we sound a teki'ah and teru'ah!³⁰ — sitting

(1) In accordance with its actions during the preceding year. By the 'world' here is probably meant only the people of Israel

(2) The general sense of this obscure expression is 'one by one', 'in single file'. Its precise meaning is discussed in the Gemara infra p. 18a q.v.

(3) Ps. XXXIII, 15.

(4) Having been sown in the previous autumn.

(5) In the coming autumn.

(6) קרי או אונם . The former by an 'act of God', the latter by an act of man', Aruch.

(7) Lit. , 'to come'. I.e., the Passover after which it had been sown.

(8) I.e., the same produce is judged in two years.

(9) Wheat and cummin, which are sown in October.

(10) Barley, 'which is sown in January or February.

(11) At the next Passover, and meanwhile it profits from the favourable judgment of the preceding Passover.

(12) This means apparently, 'all judgments are passed'.

(13) Job VII, 18.

(14) Ibid. Tosef. R.H. I.

(15) Whose judgment according to the Mishnah is on New Year.

(16) I Kings VIII, 59.

(17) Cf. supra 8b.

(18) V. P.B. p 47.

(19) Who holds that man is judged daily; v. Ned. 49a.

(20) I.e. our Mishnah.

(21) Lit., 'crying'.

(22) So that daily prayer for the sick is of some effect though judgment has already been pronounced on New Year.

(23) Passover being the season when judgment is pronounced on the produce.

(24) The connection between the loaves and fruit lies in the fact that firstfruits were not brought to the Temple before Pentecost.

(25) The ceremony of water-pouring on Tabernacles (v. Suk. 48a) was derived by the Rabbis from hints in the Pentateuch, though it is not expressly mentioned there (V. Ta'an 2b-3a).

(26) V. infra 34b.

(27) Because eventually Abraham offered a ram in place of Isaac.

(28) In the verse Sound (tik'u) the horn on the New Moon, on the appointed day of our festival. Ps. LXXXI, 4.

(29) Because the word tik'u implies only the teki'ah sound. For teru'ah and teki'ah v. Glos.

(30) Lev. XXIII, 24. E.V. 'a memorial proclaimed with the blast of horns'.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 16b

and then again sound a teki'ah and teru'ah standing? — It is so as to confuse the Accuser.¹

R. Isaac further said: If the shofar is not sounded² at the beginning of the year, evil will befall at the end of it. Why so? Because the Accuser has not been confused.

R. Isaac further said: Every year which is poor³ at its opening becomes rich before it ends, as it says, From the beginning of the year — where the word is spelt meroshith⁴ — 'unto the end'; such a year is destined to have a 'latter end'.⁵

R. Isaac further said: Man is judged only according to his actions up to the time of judgment,⁶ as it says, God hath heard the voice of the lad as he is there.⁷

R. Isaac further said: Three things call a man's iniquities to mind, namely, a shaky wall,⁸ the scrutinizing of prayer,⁹ and calling for [Divine] judgment on one's fellow man. For R. Abin said: He who calls down [Divine] judgment on his neighbour is himself punished first [for his own sins], as it says, And Sarai said unto Abram, My wrong be upon thee,¹⁰ and it is written later, And Abraham came to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her.¹¹

R. Isaac further said: Four things cancel the doom of a man, namely, charity, supplication, change of name and change of conduct. Charity, as it is written, And charity delivereth from death.¹² Supplication, as it is written, Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he delivered them out of their distresses.¹³ Change of name, as it is written, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be;¹⁴ and it continues, And I will bless her and moreover I will give thee a son of her. Change of conduct, as it is written, And God saw their works, and it continues, and God repented of the evil which he said he would do unto them and he did it not.¹⁵ Some say that change of place [also avails], as it is written, Now the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and it proceeds, and I will make of thee a great nation.¹⁶ And the other [— why does he not reckon this]? — In that case it was the merit of the land of Israel which availed him.

R. Isaac further said: It is incumbent on a man to go to pay his respects to his teacher on festivals, as it says, Wherefore wilt thou go to him today? It is neither new moon nor sabbath,¹⁷ from which we infer that on New Moon and Sabbath¹⁸ one ought to go.¹⁹

R. Isaac further said: A man should purify himself for the festival, as it says, and their carcasses ye shall not touch.²⁰ It has been taught to the same effect: 'And their carcasses ye shall not touch'. I might think that [ordinary] Israelites are cautioned not to touch carcasses. Therefore it says, Say unto the priests the sons of Aaron;²¹ [which shows that] the sons of Aaron are cautioned but ordinary Israelites are not cautioned. May we not then argue a fortiori: Seeing that in the case of a serious uncleanness,²² while the priests are cautioned Israelites are not cautioned, how much less [are they likely to be cautioned] in the case of a light uncleanness!²³ What then am I to make of the words, 'and their carcasses ye shall not touch'? — On the festival.

R. Kruspedai said in the name of R. Johanan: Three books are opened [in heaven] on New Year, one for the thoroughly wicked,²⁴ one for the thoroughly righteous, and one for the intermediate. The thoroughly righteous are forthwith inscribed definitively in the book of life; the thoroughly wicked are forthwith inscribed definitively in the book of death;²⁵ the doom of the intermediate is suspended from New Year till the Day of Atonement; if they deserve well, they are inscribed in the book of life; if they do not deserve well, they are inscribed in the book of death. Said R. Abin, What text tells us this? — Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous.²⁶ ‘Let them be blotted out from the book — this refers to the book of the wicked. ‘Of life — this is the book of the righteous. ‘And not be written with the righteous’ — this is the book of the intermediate. R. Nahman b. Isaac derives it from here: And if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written,²⁷ ‘Blot me, I pray thee’ — this is the book of the wicked. ‘Out of thy book’ — this is the book of the righteous. ‘Which thou has written’ — this is the book of the intermediate.

It has been taught: Beth Shammai say, There will be three groups at the Day of Judgment²⁸ — one of thoroughly righteous, one of thoroughly wicked, and one of intermediate. The thoroughly righteous will forthwith be inscribed definitively as entitled to everlasting life; the thoroughly wicked will forthwith be inscribed definitively as doomed to Gehinnom, as it says. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to reproaches and everlasting abhorrence.²⁹ The intermediate will go down to Gehinnom

(1) Heb. ‘Satan’. The devotion of the Jews to the precepts nullifies Satan’s accusation against them (Rashi). [The Shofar on New Year is blown twice: once at the close of the morning prayer and the reading of the Law when the congregation is seated, and again during the Musaf prayers while the people stand. According to J.R.H. IV, 8 the Shofar was originally blown only at the morning service, whence it was transferred to a later hour in the Musaf because their enemies on one occasion took the Shofar blasts early in the morning as a call to arms, whereupon they attacked the Jews. The custom of blowing the Shofar at Musaf service was retained even after the rite had been restored to the morning service].

(2) [This does not apply where New Year falls on Sabbath, in which case the Shofar may not be blown, but where the rite was omitted through some other cause (Tosaf.)].

(3) I.e., in which Israel humble themselves and make themselves poor in spirit.

(4) Defectively, and can be read **מְרֵשִׁית** from the poverty of’.

(5) Apparently there is an allusion here to the verse, ‘for the latter end of that man is peace’. Ps. XXXVII.

(6) And not in view of those which he is likely to commit at some later time. Lit., ‘of that hour’.

(7) Gen. XXI, 17. Stress is laid on the words as he is there (E.V. ‘where he is’); Ishmael was still righteous, whatever he was destined to become in the future.

(8) By passing under a shaky wall a man, as it were, ‘tempts Providence’.

(9) Lit., ‘speculation in prayer’. To see whether it produces an effect or not. [Or, ‘expectation of the immediate grant of one’s request’. The offence lies in the presumption of claiming that God must answer prayer of any kind whatsoever. V. Abrahams, I, Pharisaism and Gospels II, 78ff].

(10) Gen. XVI, 5.

(11) Which shows that Sarah died first. Ibid. XXIII, 2.

(12) Prov. X, 2 (E.V. ‘righteousness’).

(13) Ps. CVII, 6.

(14) Gen. XVII, 15.

(15) Jonah III, 10.

(16) Gen. XII, 1, 2.

(17) II Kings IV, 23.

(18) Which is a generic name for all holy days.

(19) [R. Hananel’s text reads on ‘But we have said (only) on festivals (whereas the verse speaks of New Moon and Sabbaths)? — If the teacher resides near him he must go to pay him his respects every Sabbath and New Moon; if he resides at a long distance, he must go to pay him his respects (only) on Festivals].

(20) Lev. XI, 8.

(21) Lev. XXI, 1. The text continues, there shall none defile himself for the dead among his people.

- (22) That of a dead body.
- (23) That of an animal carcass.
- (24) I.e. , those whose bad deeds definitely outweigh their good.
- (25) The life and death in the future world (i.e., of the soul) is meant. V. Tosaf. s.v. **ונחתמין** .
- (26) Ps. LXIX, 29.
- (27) Ex. XXXII, 32.
- (28) When the dead will arise in the flesh. V. Tosaf. s.v. **ליום** .
- (29) Dan. XII, 2.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 17a

and squeal¹ and rise again, as it says, And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried. They shall call on my name and I will answer them.² Of them, too, Hannah said, The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.³ Beth Hillel, however, say: He that abounds in grace inclines [the scales] towards grace,⁴ and of them David said, I love that the Lord should hear my voice and my supplication,⁵ and on their behalf David composed the whole of the passage, I was brought low and he saved me.⁶

Wrongdoers of Israel who sin with their body⁷ and wrongdoers of the Gentiles who sin with their body go down to Gehinnom and are punished there for twelve months. After twelve months their body is consumed and their soul is burnt and the wind scatters them under the soles of the feet of the righteous as it says, And ye shall tread down the wicked, and they shall be as ashes under the soles of your feet.⁸ But as for the minim⁹ and the informers and the scoffers,¹⁰ who rejected the Torah and denied the resurrection of the dead, and those who abandoned the ways of the community,¹¹ and those who 'spread their terror in the land of the living',¹² and who sinned and made the masses sin, like Jeroboam the son of Nebat and his fellows — these will go down to Gehinnom and be punished there for all generations, as it says, And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have rebelled against me¹³ etc. Gehinnom will be consumed but they will not be consumed, as it says, and their form shall wear away the nether world.¹⁴ Why all this? Because they laid hands on the habitation [zebul], as it says, that there be no habitation [zebul] for Him,¹⁵ and zebul signifies the Temple, as it says, I have surely built thee a house of habitation [zebul].¹⁶ Of them Hannah said, They that strive with the Lord shall be broken to pieces.¹⁷ R. Isaac b. Abin said: And their faces shall be black like the sides of a pot. Raba added: Among them are the most handsome of the inhabitants of Mahuza, and they shall be called 'sons of Gehinnom'.¹⁸

The Master said [above]: 'Beth Hillel say, He that abounds in grace inclines [the scales] towards grace'. [How can this be], seeing that it is written, And I shall bring the third part through the fire?¹⁹ That refers to wrongdoers of Israel who sin with their body. Wrongdoers of Israel who sin with their body! But you said that there is no remedy for them?²⁰ — There is no remedy for them when their iniquities are more numerous [than their good deeds]. We now speak of those whose iniquities and good deeds are evenly balanced, but whose iniquities include that which is committed by sinners of Israel with their body. In that case they cannot escape the doom of 'I shall bring the third through the fire', but otherwise, [in regard to them], 'He that is abundant in grace inclines towards grace', and of them David said, I love that the Lord should hear. [On this verse] Raba discoursed as follows: What is meant by the words, 'I love that the Lord should hear'? The Community of Israel exclaimed before the Holy One, blessed be He: Sovereign of the Universe, when am I beloved in thy sight? At the time when thou hearest the voice of my supplications. 'I was brought low [dalothi] and he saved me': although I am poor (dallah) in the performance of religious duties, yet it is fitting to save me.

What is meant by 'wrongdoers of Israel who sin with their body'? — Rab said: This refers to the cranium which does not put on the phylactery.²¹ Who are 'the wrongdoers of the Gentiles who sin with their body'? — Rab said: This refers to [sexual] sin. 'Who have spread their terror in the land of the living': [who are these]? — R. Hisda said: This is a communal leader²² who makes himself unduly feared by the community for purposes other than religious.²³ Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: Any communal leader who makes himself unduly feared by the community for purposes other than religious will never have a scholar for a son, as it says, Therefore if men fear him, he shall not see [among his sons] any wise of heart.²⁴

'Beth Hillel say: He that abounds in grace inclines [the scales] to grace'. How does He do? — R. Eliezer²⁵ says: He presses down [the scale of merit], as it says, He will again have compassion on us,

he will press down our iniquities.²⁶ R. Jose b. Hanina says: [He does so] by raising [the scale of iniquities], as it says, Raising²⁷ iniquity and passing by transgression.²⁸ In the school of R. Ishmael they taught: He puts aside every first iniquity;²⁹ and herein lies the attribute [of grace]. Raba said: The iniquity itself is not obliterated, and if there is an excess of iniquities³⁰ [God] reckons it with the others.³¹

Raba said: He who forgoes his right [to exact punishment]³² is forgiven all his iniquities, as it says, Forgiving iniquity and passing by transgression. Who is forgiven iniquity? One who passes by transgression [against himself]. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua was once ill. R. Papa went to inquire about him. He saw that he was very ill³³ and said to those present, Make ready provisions for his [everlasting] journey.³⁴ Eventually, however, he [R. Huna] recovered, and R. Papa felt ashamed to see him. He said to him, What did you see [in your illness]? He replied, It was indeed as you thought, but the Holy One, blessed be He, said to them [the angels]: Because he does not insist upon his rights, do not be particular with him, as it says, Forgiving iniquity and passing by transgression. Who is forgiven iniquity? He who passes by transgression. [The verse continues], ‘to the remnant of his heritage’. R. Aha son of R. Hanina said: We have here a fat tail with a thorn in it.³⁵ ‘for the remnant of his inheritance’, but not for all his inheritance.

(1) On account of their punishment. Al. ‘struggle and rise’. [Ginzberg L.: ‘be singed’, i.e., by the fires of the Gehinnom, and after this experience arise thence and be healed. V. Moore S.F. Judaism III, p. 198].

(2) Zech. XIII, 9.

(3) 1 Sam. II, 6.

(4) And does not doom them to Gehinnom.

(5) Ps. CXVI, 1. Further on we read, The cords of death compassed me (v. 3).

(6) Ibid. 6.

(7) This is explained infra.

(8) Mal. III, 21.

(9) V. Glos. The reference is probably to the Judeo-Christians, as the Sadducees would be included under ‘those who denied the resurrection’.

(10) אַפִּיקוֹרְסִים ; those who treat the Rabbis and students of the Torah with disdain. If this is meant, then we should insert with MS.M. the words ‘and those’ before the word ‘who’.

(11) Rashi deletes these words, (on the ground that they do not designate a separate class, but are a general description of all the classes mentioned.

(12) A phrase borrowed from Ezek. XXXII, 23. It is explained infra.

(13) Isa. LXVI, 24.

(14) Ps. XLIX, 15.

(15) Ibid. (E.V. ‘for it’. [It is through the sins of such as these that the Temple has been destroyed (Rashi). If the reference is to Jewish Christians it may allude to their repudiation of the claims of the Temple as the place where alone true and perfect worship could be offered, V. Herford, Christianity in Talmud p. 135].

(16) I Kings VIII, 13.

(17) I Sam. II, 10.

(18) [The passage is difficult. Read with MS.M. ‘The Master said (above) "Of them (of the intermediate class) Hannah said The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up". R. Isaac b. Abin said, And their faces (that is, of the intermediate class) shall (on rising from Gehinnom) be black like the sides of the pot. Raba added, And yet (despite this disfigurement) they shall be more beautiful than the most handsome men of Mahuza who shall be called the sons of Gehinnom’. V. D.S. a.l.].

(19) Which was explained above to refer to the intermediate.

(20) I.e., that after passing through the fire they become dust.

(21) Even this in an Israelite is sufficient to merit Gehinnom.

(22) Heb. Parnas. (V. Git., Sonc. ed., p. 280, n. 9).

(23) I.e., not merely to make them keep the commandments.

(24) Job XXXVII, 24. E.V. Men do therefore fear Him; He regardeth not any that are wise of heart.

(25) [Read with MSM. R. Eleazar].

(26) I.e., press down the scale of merit against our iniquities, Micah VII, 19.

(27) E.V. 'that pardoneth'.

(28) Ibid. 18.

(29) Rashi and Asheri explain this to mean that if without the first iniquity the good deeds are in excess, then the first iniquity is not put back in the scale.

(30) I.e., if even so the iniquities just balance the merits.

(31) So as to count him guilty.

(32) Lit., 'passes by his measures'.

(33) Lit. 'the world (life) was getting weak for him'.

(34) I.e., prepare shrouds.

(35) A certain breed of sheep in the East have very long tails which are esteemed a great delicacy, but as they trail on the ground they often pick up thorns. Hence the proverbial expression, 'a tail with a thorn in it' for a good thing containing a snag.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 17b

[What it means is], for him who makes himself a mere remnant.¹

R. Huna contrasted [two parts of the same verse]. It is written, The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and then it is written, and gracious in all his works.² [How is this]?³ — At first righteous and at the end gracious.⁴ R. Eleazar [similarly] contrasted two texts. It is written, Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, and then it is written, For thou renderest to every man according to his work.⁵ [How is this]? — At first, 'Thou renderest to every man according to his work', but at the end, 'unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy'.

Ilfi (or, as some report, Ilfa) [similarly] contrasted two texts: It is written, abundant in goodness, and then it is written, and in truth.⁶ [How is this]? — At first, 'truth', and at the end 'abundant in goodness'.

And 'the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed [etc.]⁷ R. Johanan said: Were it not written in the text, it would be impossible for us to say such a thing; this verse teaches us that the Holy One, blessed be He, drew his robe round Him like the reader⁸ of a congregation and showed Moses the order of prayer. He said to him: Whenever Israel sin, let them carry out this service before Me,⁹ and I will forgive them.

'The Lord, the Lord': I am the Eternal¹⁰ before a man sins and the same¹⁰ after a man sins and repents. 'A God merciful and gracious:' Rab Judah said: A covenant has been made with the thirteen attributes¹¹ that they will not be turned away empty-handed,¹² as it says, Behold I make a covenant.¹³

R. Johanan said: Great is the power of repentance that it rescinds¹⁴ a man's final sentence, as it says, Make the heart of this people fat and make their ears heavy and shut their eyes, lest they seeing with their eyes and hearing with their ears and understanding with their heart return and be healed.¹⁵ Said R. Papa to Abaye: Perhaps this was before the final sentence? — He replied: It is written, 'and he be healed'. What is that which requires healing? You must say, the final sentence.

An objection [against this view] was raised [from the following]: 'If one repents in the interval,¹⁶ he is forgiven; if he does not repent in the interval, should he even offer [subsequently] all the rams of Nebayoth,¹⁷ he is not forgiven'! — There is no contradiction: the latter statement refers to an individual, the former to a community.

A further objection was raised [from the following]: ‘The eyes of the Lord thy God are upon it [the land of Israel],¹⁸ sometimes for good, sometimes for evil. How sometimes for good? Suppose Israel were [in the class of] the thoroughly wicked at New Year,¹⁹ and scanty rains were decreed for them, and afterwards they repented. [For God] to increase the supply of rain is impossible, because the decree has been issued. The Holy One, blessed be He, therefore sends down the rain in the proper season on the land that requires it,²⁰ all according to the district. How sometimes for evil? Suppose Israel were [in the class of] the thoroughly virtuous on New Year, and abundant rains were decreed for them, but afterwards they backslided. To diminish the rains is impossible, because the decree has been issued. The Holy One, blessed be He, therefore sends them down not in their proper season and on land that does not require them’.²¹ Now, [if the decree can be rescinded], for good at any rate, let the decree be rescinded and let the rains be increased? — There is a special reason there, namely, that this²² is sufficient.

Come and hear [a further objection]: ‘They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters, they saw the works of the Lord . . . For he commanded and raised the stormy wind which lifted up the waves thereof . . . they reeled to and fro and staggered like a drunken man . . . They cried unto the Lord in their trouble . . . let them give thanks unto the Lord for his mercy²³ etc. [The Psalmist] inserted here signs²⁴ having the same force as the ‘buts’ and ‘onlys’ of the Torah,²⁵ to indicate that if they cried before the final sentence they were answered, but if they cried after the final sentence they were not ‘answered’! — These also are on the same footing as individuals.

Come and hear [again]: ‘Bluria²⁶ the proselyte put this question to Rabban Gamaliel: It is written in your Law, [she said], who lifteth not up the countenance,²⁷ and it is also written, The Lord shall lift up his countenance upon thee.²⁸ R. Jose the priest joined the conversation and said to her: I will give you a parable which will illustrate the matter.²⁹ A man lent his neighbour a maneh and fixed a time for payment in the presence of the king, while the other swore to pay him by the life of the king. When the time arrived he did not pay him, and he went to excuse himself to the king. The king, however, said to him: The wrong done to me I excuse you, but go and obtain forgiveness from your neighbour. So here: one text speaks of offences committed by a man against God, the other of offences committed by a man against his fellow man. [This explanation was generally accepted] until R. Akiba came and taught

(1) I.e., who is self-effacing.

(2) Ps. CXLV, 17.

(3) How can God be both righteous (i.e., just) and gracious at the same time?

(4) When He sees that in strict justice the world cannot endure.

(5) Ps. LXII, 13.

(6) Ex. XXXIV, 6.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Lit., ‘emissary’; the one appointed to lead the congregational prayers. It is usual for such a one to draw his robe over his head.

(9) I.e., read from the Torah the passage containing the thirteen attributes.

(10) Lit., ‘He’. The Divine name YHWH (E.V. ‘the Lord’) designates the divine attribute of mercy (Rashi).

(11) Enumerated in this verse. According to one reckoning, ‘The Lord, the Lord’ count as two, according to another reckoning only the second of these counts as an attribute, and the expressions ‘keeping mercy’ and ‘unto the thousandth generation’ count as two attributes. V. Tosaf., s.v. **שש**.

(12) I.e., that Israel will not be turned away empty-handed when they recite them.

(13) Ibid. 10.

(14) Lit., ‘tears up’.

(15) Isa. VI, 10.

(16) Between New Year and the Day of Atonement.

(17) Cf. Isa. LX, 7.

(18) Deut. XI, 12.

(19) I.e. at New Year their evil deeds in the past clearly exceeded their good deeds.

(20) E.g., gardens and orchards.

(21) E.g. on barren land.

(22) Sending the rain in the proper place and time.

(23) Ps. CVII, 23-31.

(24) In the Hebrew text an inverted nun is inserted before the verses 23-28 of this passage.

(25) It was a principle of R. Akiba that wherever the words **ב** (but) and **א** (only) occur in the Pentateuch, they are meant to except something which is not explicitly mentioned in the text.

(26) Valeria.

(27) Deut. X, 17. E. V. 'who regardeth not persons', 'countenance' referring to man's. It is here, however, taken as referring to God's in the sense of 'who shows not favour', as in the passage next quoted.

(28) Num. VI, 26.

(29) Lit., 'to what the thing is like'.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 18a

: One text speaks of God's attitude before the final sentence, the other of his attitude after the final sentence!' — Here too the case is that of an individual.

On the question of the final sentence of an individual there is a difference between Tannaim, as it has been taught: R. Meir used to say: Two men take to their bed suffering equally from the same disease, or two men are before a criminal court to be judged¹ for the same offence; yet one gets up² and the other does not get up, one escapes death and the other does not escape death. Why does one get up and the other not? Why does one escape death and the other not? Because one prayed and was answered, and the other prayed and was not answered. Why was one answered and the other not? One prayed with his whole heart³ and was therefore answered, the other did not pray with his whole heart and was not answered. R. Eleazar, however, said: The one man was praying before his final sentence had been pronounced [in heaven], the other after his final sentence had been pronounced.

R. Isaac said: Supplication⁴ is good for a man whether before the final sentence has been pronounced or after.

But can the final sentence on a community be rescinded? Have we not one text which says, Wash thy heart from wickedness,⁵ and another which says, For though thou wash thee with nitre and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me,⁶ and does not the one text apply before the final sentence is pronounced and the other after? — No; both apply after the final sentence has been pronounced, yet there is no contradiction; in the one case the final sentence has been accompanied by an oath, in the other it has not been accompanied by an oath. This accords with the dictum of R. Samuel b. Ammi. For R. Samuel b. Ammi (or, as some say R. Samuel b. Nahmani) said in the name of R. Jonathan: How do we know that a final sentence accompanied by an oath is never rescinded? Because it says, Therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be expiated with sacrifice nor offering.⁷ Raba said: With sacrifice and offering it cannot be expiated, but it can be expiated with Torah. Abaye said: With sacrifice and offering it cannot be expiated, but it can be expiated with Torah and charitable deeds. Rabbah⁸ and Abaye were of the house of Eli. Rabbah who devoted himself to the Torah lived forty years, Abaye who devoted himself both to the Torah and to charitable deeds lived sixty years.⁹

The Rabbis taught: There was a family in Jerusalem the members of which used to die at the age of eighteen. They came and told Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai. He said to them, Perhaps you are of the family of Eli, to whom it was said, and all the increase of thy house shall die young men.¹⁰ Go and study the Torah and you may live. They went and studied the Torah and lived, and they used to call

that family the family of Rabban Johanan after his name.

R. Samuel b. Inia said in the name of Rab: Whence do we know that the final sentence on a community is never sealed? — Never sealed, [you say]? Is it not written, Thine iniquity is marked before me?¹¹ What he should say is, [How do we know that] although it is sealed it can yet be rescinded? Because it says, as the Lord our God is whenever we call upon him.¹² But it is written, Seek ye the Lord while he may be found?¹³ — This verse speaks of an individual, the other of community. When can an individual [find God]? — Rabbah b. Abbuha said: These are the ten days between New Year and the Day of Atonement.

And it came to pass after the ten days that the Lord smote Nabal.¹⁴ How come these ten days here? — Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: They correspond to the ten dishes which Nabal gave to the servants of David.¹⁵ R. Nahman said in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha: These are the ten days between New Year and the Day of Atonement.

ON NEW YEAR ALL MANKIND PASS BEFORE HIM LIKE CHILDREN OF MARON.¹⁶ What is the meaning of the expression 'like children of Maron'? — In Babylon it was translated, 'like a flock of sheep'.¹⁷ Resh Lakish said: As [in] the ascent of Beth Maron.¹⁸

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: Like the troops of the house of David.¹⁹ Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan: [All the same] they are all viewed with a simple glance. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: We also have learnt the same idea: He that fashioneth the hearts of them all, that considereth all their doings.²⁰ What does this mean? Shall I say that it means this, that [God] has created all creatures and unites all their hearts together? But we see that this is not so! No; what it means is this: 'The Creator sees²¹ their hearts together and considereth all their doings'.

MISHNAH. THERE ARE SIX NEW MOONS TO REPORT WHICH²² MESSENGERS GO FORTH [FROM JERUSALEM²³ TO THE DIASPORA]. [THE NEW MOON] OF NISAN ON ACCOUNT OF PASSOVER,²⁴ OF AB²⁵ ON ACCOUNT OF THE FAST,²⁶ OF ELUL ON ACCOUNT OF NEW YEAR,²⁷ OF TISHRI FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE FESTIVALS,²⁸ OF KISLEV ON ACCOUNT OF HANUKAH,²⁹ AND OF ADAR ON ACCOUNT OF PURIM.³⁰ WHEN THE TEMPLE STOOD, THEY USED ALSO TO GO FORTH TO REPORT IYAR ON ACCOUNT OF THE LESSER PASSOVER.³¹

GEMARA. Why should they not also go forth to report Tammuz and Tebeth³²

(1) So Rashi: Aliter: 'ascend the scaffold to be punished'.]

(2) Lit., 'comes down', i.e., from the bed.

(3) Lit., 'a perfect prayer'.

(4) Lit., 'cry'.

(5) Jer. IV, 14.

(6) Ibid. II, 22.

(7) I Sam. III, 14.

(8) Bar Nahmani, the colleague of R. Hisda. V. Tosaf. s.v. רבה .

(9) [Forty and sixty are mere round figures, as there is evidence that Rabbah lived more than forty years. The main thing the Talmud wishes to point out is that Abaye lived longer than Rabbah for the reason stated. V. Funk. S., Die Juden in Babylonian II, Note I and cf. A.Z., Sonc. ed., p. 101, n. 6.]

(10) I Sam. II, 33.

(11) Jer. II, 22.

(12) Deut. IV, 7.

(13) Isa. LV, 6. This implies that God cannot always be found.

(14) I Sam. XXV, 38. The question is suggested by the use of the definite article with the word 'ten'.

(15) David sent to Nabal ten young men (I Sam. XXV, 5), and Nabal according to tradition gave them each one meal. This hospitable act secured for him some respite.

(16) מרון .

(17) Passing through a wicket to be counted one by one. The word 'maron' is here connected with the Aramaic אמרא , a sheep.

(18) Var. lec. Beth Horon. A narrow pass where wayfarers had to proceed in single file.

(19) Which pass in review one by one. The word 'maron' is here connected with מרות , 'lordship'. [Cf. the reading of the Vienna MS.: נומרין (numerus), i.e., a troop of soldiers].

(20) Ps. XXXIII, 15.

(21) This word being supplied from 'beholdeth' in v. 13.

(22) I.e., to report whether the Beth din in Jerusalem have made the New Moon on the thirtieth or the thirty-first day after the preceding New Moon. Lit., 'for six months'.

(23) As soon as the New Moon has been declared, on the twenty-ninth or the thirtieth day as the case may be.

(24) So that before Passover arrives the Jews in the Diaspora will know which day is the fifteenth.

(25) There is no need for them to go on Sivan, because the date of Pentecost is known from the counting of the 'Omer.

(26) The ninth of Ab.

(27) Knowing the New Moon of Elul, the Jews of the Diaspora will fix New Year thirty days later, Elul usually having twenty-nine days, though there is still a risk that the Beth din may in any particular year declare Elul to have thirty.

(28) Viz., the Day of Atonement and Tabernacles, about which they could not be any more sure than about New Year.

(29) Which commences on Kislev 25.

(30) Adar the 14th.

(31) The Passover for the unclean, kept on the fourteenth of Iyar. V. Num. IX, 1-14.

(32) On account of the fasts of the seventeenth of Tammuz and the tenth of Tebeth.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 18b

seeing that R. Hanah b. Bizna has said in the name of R. Simeon the Saint: 'What is the meaning of the verse, Thus had said the Lord of Hosts: The fast of the fourth month and the fast of the fifth and the fast of the seventh and the fast of the tenth shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness?'¹ The prophet calls these days both days of fasting and days of joy, signifying that when there is peace they shall be for joy and gladness, but if there is not peace they shall be fast days'! — R. Papa replied: What it means is this: When there is peace they shall be for joy and gladness; if there is persecution,² they shall be fast days; if there is no persecution but yet not peace, then those who desire may fast and those who desire need not fast.³ If that is the case, the ninth of Ab also [should be optional]? — R. Papa replied: The ninth of Ab is in a different category, because several misfortunes happened on it, as a Master has said: On the ninth of Ab the Temple was destroyed both the first time and the second time, and Bethar was captured⁴ and the city [Jerusalem] was ploughed.⁵

It has been taught: R. Simeon said: There are four expositions among those given by R. Akiba with which I do not agree. [He said]:⁶ 'The fast of the fourth month' — this is the ninth of Tammuz, on which a breach was made in the walls of the city,⁷ as it says, On the fourth month on the ninth of the month the famine was sore in the city, so that there was no bread for the people of the land, and a breach was made in the city.⁸ Why is it called fourth? As being fourth in the order of months. 'The fast of the fifth month': this is the ninth of Ab, on which the House of our God was burnt. Why is it called fifth? as being fifth in the order of months. 'The fast of the seventh month': this is the third of Tishri on which Gedaliah the son of Ahikam was killed.⁹ Who killed him? Ishmael the son of Nethaniah killed him; and [the fact that a fast was instituted on this day] shows that the death of the righteous is put on a level with the burning of the House of our God. Why is it called the seventh? As being the seventh in the order of months. 'The fast of the tenth month': this is the tenth of Tebeth on which the king of Babylon invested Jerusalem, as it says, And the word of the Lord came unto me in the ninth year in the tenth month, in the tenth day of the month, saying, Son of man, write thee the name of the day, even of this selfsame day; this selfsame day the king of Babylon hath invested

Jerusalem.¹⁰ Why is it called the tenth? As being the tenth in the order of months. [It might be asked], should not this have been mentioned first?¹¹ Why then was it mentioned in this place [last]? So as to arrange the months in their proper order. I, however, [continued R. Simeon], do not explain thus. What I say is that ‘the fast of the tenth month, is the fifth of Tebeth on which news came to the Captivity that the city had been smitten, as it says, And it came to pass in the twelfth year of our captivity, in the tenth month, in the fifth day of the month, that one who had escaped out of Jerusalem came to me saying, The city is smitten,¹² and they put the day of the report on the same footing as the day of burning. My view is more probable than his, because I make the first [mentioned by the prophet] first [chronologically] and the last last,¹³ whereas he makes the first last and the last first, he, however, following [only] the order of months I [also follow] the order of calamities.

It has been stated [elsewhere]: Rab and R. Hanina hold that the Megillath Ta'anith¹⁴ has been annulled,¹⁵ whereas R. Johanan and Resh Lakish hold that the Megillath Ta'anith, has not been annulled. Rab and R. Hanina hold that the Megillath Ta'anith has been annulled, interpreting the words of the prophet thus: ‘When there is peace, these days¹⁶ shall be for joy and gladness, but when there is no peace, they shall be fasts’, and placing the days mentioned in the Megillath Ta'anith, on the same footing. R. Johanan and Resh Lakish hold that the Megillath Ta'anith has not been annulled, maintaining that it was those others [mentioned by the prophet] that the All-Merciful made dependent on the existence of the Temple,¹⁷ but these [mentioned in Megillath Ta'anith] remain unaffected.

R. Kahana cited the following in objection: ‘On one occasion a fast was decreed in Lydda on Hanukah¹⁸ and R. Eliezer went down there and bathed and R. Joshua had his hair cut,¹⁹ and they said to the inhabitants, Go and fast in atonement for having fasted [on this day]!’²⁰ — R. Joseph said: Hanukah is different, because there is a religious ceremony [attached to it]²¹ Said Abaye to him: Let it be abolished and its ceremony with it?²² — R. Joseph thereupon [corrected himself and] said: Hanukah is different because it commemorates publicly a miracle.²³

R. Aha b. Huna raised an objection [from the following]: ‘On the third of Tishri the mention [of God] in bonds was abolished:²⁴ for the Grecian²⁵ Government had forbidden the mention of

God's name²⁶ by the Israelites, and when the Government of the Hasmoneans became strong and defeated them, they ordained that they should mention the name of God even on bonds, and they used to write thus: ‘In the year So-and-so of Johanan, High Priest to the Most High God’, and when the Sages heard of it they said, ‘To-morrow this man will pay his debt and the bond will be thrown²⁷ on a dunghill’, and they stopped them, and they made that day a feast day.²⁸ Now if you maintain that the Megillath Ta'anith has been annulled, [is it possible that] while the former [prohibitions of fasting] have been annulled, new ones should be added? — With what are we here dealing? With the period when the Temple was still standing

(1) Zech. VIII, 19.

(2) Lit., ‘decrees of the Government’.

(3) Since these fasts were at the time of this Mishnah optional, no messengers were sent forth on their account.

(4) In the war of Bar Cochba.

(5) V. Ta'an. 20b.

(6) In expounding the verse from Zechariah quoted above.

(7) [The fast of Tammuz observed nowadays on the seventeenth of the month is in commemoration of the same calamity at the Second Destruction; v. Ta'an. 26b. Supra on Deut. VI, 4 reads, ‘on the seventeenth’ following J. Ta'an. IV, 8 that also point in their evidence since in the absence of witnesses the New Moon is on the first time the breach was made on the seventeenth, the ‘ninth’ mentioned in the text being due to miscalculation caused by the confusion of the time, v. Tosaf. s.v. טײַ].

- (8) Jer. LII, 6, 7.
- (9) V. Jer. XLI, 1, 2.
- (10) Ezek. XXIV, 1, 2.
- (11) The event commemorated being chronologically the first of those mentioned.
- (12) Ezek. XXXIII, 21. This is one of the four expositions in which R. Simeon differed from his teacher, R. Akiba. The other three are found in the Tosefta of Sot. VI and Sifre on Deut. VI, 4.
- (13) The fast of the fourth month.
- (14) Lit., 'Scroll of Fasting': a record of days on which it was prohibited to fast in memory of some joyful event which had happened on that date. It dates back in part before the destruction of the Second Temple (v. Shab. 13b). Its present form dates from the days of Hadrian.
- (15) Apparently we have to supply, 'since the destruction of the Temple'.
- (16) The four days mentioned by Zechariah.
- (17) So that when the Temple is restored and there is peace these fasts are abolished.
- (18) One of the Festivals mentioned in Megillath Ta'anith.
- (19) R. Eliezer and R. Joshua were disciples of R. Johanan b. Zaccai, and became authorities only after the destruction of the Temple. Bathing and haircutting were prohibited on fast days.
- (20) And if it was prohibited to fast on Hanukah, so also on the other days mentioned in Megillath Ta'anith.
- (21) Viz., the kindling of the lights.
- (22) Seeing that it is purely Rabbinical.
- (23) By the kindling of lights, and the people regard its ceremony like one ordained in the Torah.
- (24) This is a sentence from Megillath Ta'anith, which the Baraita explains.
- (25) I.e., Syrian.
- (26) Lit., 'the name of heaven'. [Cf. Gen. Rab. 11, 4: 'The Jews were ordered by the Greeks to write on the horn of the ox, "We have no share in the God of Israel"'].
- (27) Lit., 'it is found that the name of heaven is lying about'.
- (28) [Geiger, Urschrift, p. 34 places this in the last days of John Hyrcanus when the Pharisees turned against him; Graetz, Geschichte III, 2 p. 572 during the reign of Queen Salome when the Pharisees were in power. For other views, v. Lichtenstein, H, HUCA, pp. 283ff].

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 19a

. But [if that is so], cannot the prohibition [of the third of Tishri] be derived from the fact that it was the day on which Gedaliah the son of Ahikam was killed?¹ — Rab replied: Its [insertion in the Megillath Ta'anith] was required only to prohibit the day before it also.² But the prohibition of the day before it can also be derived from the fact that it is the day after New Moon?² — New Moon is ordained by the Written Law, and the ordinances of the Written Law do not require reinforcement, as it has been taught: 'These days which are mentioned in Megillath Ta'anith are forbidden [for fasting on] along with both the day before them and the day after them. As to Sabbaths and New Moons, they themselves are forbidden, but the days before and after them are permitted. What is the difference between one set and the other? The one set are ordained by the Torah,³ and the words of the Torah require no reinforcement, whereas the other are laid down by the Scribes, and the words of the Scribes require reinforcement'.⁴ But cannot the prohibition [of the second of Tishri] be derived from the fact that it is the day before the day on which Gedaliah the son of Ahikam was killed?⁵ — R. Ashi replied: The fast of Gedaliah the son of Ahikam is laid down in the later Scriptures,⁶ and the words of the later Scriptures are on the same footing as those of the Torah.

R. Tobi b. Mattenah raised the following objection [against the statement that Megillath Ta'anith has been annulled]: "On the twenty-eighth thereof [of Adar] came glad tidings to the Jews that they should not abandon the practice of the Law". For the Government [of Rome] had issued a decree that they should not study the Torah and that they should not circumcise their sons and that they should profane the Sabbath. What did Judah b. Shammu'a and his colleagues do? They went and consulted a certain matron whom all the Roman notables used to visit.⁷ She said to them: "Go and make

proclamation [of your sorrows] at night time". They went and proclaimed at night, crying, "Alas, in heaven's name, are we not your brothers, are we not the sons of one father and are we not the sons of one mother? Why are we different from every nation and tongue that you issue such harsh decrees against us?" The decrees were thereupon annulled, and that day was declared a feast day'.⁸ Now if you maintain that the Megillath Ta'anith⁹ was annulled, [is it possible that] after the earlier prohibitions had been annulled they should add new ones? And should you reply that this also was in the period when the Temple was still standing, [this cannot be], because Judah b. Shammu'a was the disciple of R. Meir, and R. Meir was after the destruction of the Temple. We know [that R. Judah was R. Meir's disciple] because it has been taught: 'If holes were made in a vessel of glass and filled up with lead, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel reports that R. Judah b. Shammu'a in the name of R. Meir declares it unclean,¹⁰

(1) On which, as established above, fasting was prohibited in the period of the Temple.

(2) V. infra.

(3) The Pentateuch.

(4) And the days before and after are prohibited lest one should come to fast on the actual day.

(5) Cf. p. 75, n. 1.

(6) Viz., Zechariah. Lit., 'words of Kabbalah. V. supra p., 23 n. 10.

(7) [Probably the widow of Tineius Rufus (v. A.Z. 20a) whose home was in Caesarea, (Graetz, Geschichte IV, p. 169)].

(8) [Graetz, loc. cit. refers this to the withdrawal of the Hadrianic edicts by his successor Antonius Pius in 139 — 140. For other views v. Lichtenstein op. cit. p. 279].

(9) I.e., those days that were inserted in the list before the destruction of the Temple.

(10) Supposing it had been unclean, it now reverts to the uncleanness which it had lost when it was broken, v. Shab. 15b. Or it may mean 'becomes capable of receiving uncleanness'. V. Rashi a.l. and Tosaf. s.v. יהודה .

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 19b

whereas the Sages declare it clean'! — There is a difference of opinion between Tannaim [as to whether the Megillath Ta'anith, has been annulled], as it has been taught: 'These days which are mentioned in the Megillath Ta'anith are prohibited [to be kept as fast days] whether in the period when the Temple is standing or in the period when the Temple is not standing. So R. Meir. R. Jose says: In the period when the Temple is standing they are prohibited, because they [Israel] have cause for rejoicing; in the period when the Temple is not standing they are permitted, because they have cause for mourning'. The law is that these prohibitions are annulled and the law is that they are not annulled. There is a contradiction, is there not, between these two laws? — There is no contradiction: the one¹ relates to Hanukah and Purim, the other to the other days.

OF ELUL ON ACCOUNT OF NEW YEAR, OF TISHRI FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE FESTIVALS. Once the messengers have gone forth to report [the new moon of] Elul, why should they be required to do so for Tishri? Should you reply that [the reason is because] perhaps Elul has been prolonged,² [this cannot be], because R. Hinena b. Kahana has said in the name of Rabbi: 'From the days of Ezra onwards we have found no instance of Elul being prolonged'! — [Exactly so]: 'We find no instance', because there was no reason [to prolong it]; where, however, there is a special reason,³ we do prolong it. But in that case New Year is interfered with?⁴ — It is better that New Year should be interfered with than that all the festivals should be interfered with. There is also an indication [that this view is correct in the language of the Mishnah], which states, OF TISHRI FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE FESTIVALS. This is clear proof.

OF KISLEV ON ACCOUNT OF HANUKAH AND OF ADAR ON ACCOUNT OF PURIM. [The Mishnah], however, does not say, 'When the year is prolonged,⁵ messengers go forth to report [the new moon of] the second Adar also on account of Purim'. [This shows that] our Mishnah does not agree with Rabbi, since it has been taught: 'Rabbi says that if the year has been prolonged,

messengers go forth to report also regarding the second Adar on account of Purim'. Shall we say that the point on which they join issue is this, that one authority holds that all the ceremonies observed in the second Adar⁶ are observed also in the first,⁷ while the other holds that the ceremonies observed in the second are not observed in the first?⁸ — No. Both hold that the ceremonies observed in the second are not observed in the first, and here they differ on the question of the prolongation of the year,⁹ as it has been taught: 'How long is the period of the prolongation of the year? Thirty days. Simeon b. Gamaliel, however, says a month'.¹⁰ But why should only [the one who says] thirty days [require no messengers to be sent]? Because, you say, people in this case know when the month ends?¹¹ If the period is a month, they also know! — R. Papa said: The one who said 'a month' holds that [the Beth din may prolong the year] either by thirty days or by a month at their option.¹²

R. Joshua b. Levi testified on behalf of the holy community of Jerusalem concerning the two Adars, that they are sanctified on the day of their prolongation.¹³ This is equivalent to saying that we make them defective but we do not make them full, and excludes the statement made in a discourse by R. Nahman b. Hisda; [for R. Nahman b. Hisda stated in a discourse]: 'R. Simai testified in the name of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi concerning the two Adars that if they [the Beth din] desired they could make both of them full, and if they desired they could make both of them, defective, and if they desired they could make one full and the other defective; and such was their custom in the Diaspora. In the name of our teacher,¹⁴ however, they said: One is always to be full and the next defective, unless you have been informed that New Moon has been fixed at its proper time'.¹⁵

They sent [from Palestine] to Mar 'Ukba to say: The Adar which precedes Nisan is always defective. R. Nahman raised an objection [from the following]: 'For the fixing of two New Moons the Sabbath may be profaned,¹⁶ for those of Nisan and of Tishri'. Now if you say that [the Adar before Nisan] is sometimes full and sometimes defective, I can understand how occasions arise for profaning the Sabbath

(1) That fasting is prohibited.

(2) I.e., made to last thirty days, and therefore the Diaspora may make a mistake about the Day of Atonement and Tabernacles.

(3) The 'special reason' is discussed *infra*, 20a.

(4) Lit., 'spoilt'. The Diaspora will keep it one day too soon.

(5) I.e., made to consist of thirteen months, by the insertion of a second Adar.

(6) Including in particular Purim.

(7) And therefore the observance of Purim in the first Adar is really sufficient for religious purposes, and so there is no need to send out messengers to fix the date of the second.

(8) And therefore it is important that Purim in the second Adar should be kept on the right day, *v. Meg. 6b*.

(9) I.e., the [days of the month of the first Adar which is inserted to prolong the year (Rashi)].

(10) I.e., twenty-nine days. This is apparently the opinion of Rabbi also.

(11) When the first Adar ends and the second Adar begins.

(12) And therefore it is necessary to keep the public informed. (9) [Regarded by some as a survival of an Essene community, *v. J.E V. p. 226*].

(13) The thirtieth day is known as the day of prolongation (**יום עיבור**) as it is the day which is added to make the preceding month full (*v. supra p. 21, n. 7*). In the case of the two Adars the thirtieth day of each is sanctified as the New Moon of the next month.

(14) Rab.

(15) I.e., that the Beth din in Jerusalem fixed the New Moon of Adar II on the thirtieth day of the first Adar, the thirtieth day always being regarded as the 'proper time' of New Moon.

(16) By the watchers for the new moon, who are allowed to exceed the two thousand cubit limit in order to report their observation to the Beth din in Jerusalem. *V. infra 23b*.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 20a

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 20a

. But if it is always defective, why should they profane it?¹ — Because it is a religious duty to sanctify [the New Moon] on the strength of actual observation.² According to another version, R. Nahman said: We also have learnt: 'For the fixing of two New Moons the Sabbath may be profaned, for those of Nisan and of Tishri'. Now if you say that the Adar which precedes Nisan is always defective, there is no difficulty; the reason why Sabbath may be profaned is because it is a religious duty to sanctify [the New Moon] on the strength of actual observation. But if you say that it is sometimes full and sometimes defective, why should [the Sabbath] be profaned? Let us prolong [the month] today and sanctify [the New Moon] to-morrow?³ — If the thirtieth day happens to be on Sabbath, that is actually what we do. Here, however, we are dealing with the case where the thirty-first day happens to fall on Sabbath [and we allow the Sabbath to be profaned because] it is a religious duty to sanctify on the strength of actual observation.⁴

R. Kahana raised [against the instruction sent to Mar 'Ukba] the following objection: 'When the Temple stood, Sabbath was profaned for the fixing of all the months, for the sake of the adjustment of the sacrifice'.⁵ Now since the reason [for allowing the profanation of the Sabbath] was not in the case of all the other [months] because it is a religious duty to sanctify on the strength of actual observation, neither is the reason in the case of Nisan and Tishri because it is a religious duty to sanctify on the strength of actual observation.⁶ Now if you say that the Adar preceding Nisan is sometimes full and sometimes defective, there is no difficulty: for the reason mentioned we allow the profanation of the Sabbath. But if you say that it is always defective, why should we allow the profanation?⁷ — This is unanswerable.⁸

When 'Ulla came [from Palestine to Babylon], he said: They have prolonged Elul.⁹ Said 'Ulla thereupon: Do our Babylonian colleagues recognize what a boon we are conferring on them? What was the boon? — 'Ulla said: On account of the vegetables;¹⁰

R. Aha b. Hanina said: On account of the [unburied] dead.¹¹ What difference does it make [in practice which view we adopt here]? — There is a difference, in the case of a Day of Atonement coming just after Sabbath. According to him who says that the reason is because of the [unburied] dead, we prolong Elul [so as to prevent this], but according to him who says that it is because of vegetables, [we do not do so, because] when are the vegetables required? For the evening [after the Day of Atonement]; and in the evening we can get fresh ones. But even if we accept the view that the reason is because of vegetables, we should still prolong Elul because of the unburied dead? — We must therefore say that the practical difference is in the case of a festival which comes just before or just after Sabbath. In such a case, according to him who says the reason is because of vegetables,¹² we prolong Elul [to prevent this], but according to him who says it is because of the [unburied] dead, [we do not do so], because they can be attended to by heathens. But even if we accept the view that it is because of the [unburied] dead, let us still prolong Elul on account of the vegetables? — Vegetables can be [freshened by being put] in hot water. If that is the case, why is it a boon only for us [in Babylon]? Why not also for them [in Palestine] — We suffer from oppressive heat, they do not suffer from oppressive heat.¹³

Is all this correct,¹⁴ seeing that Rabbah b. Samuel has learnt: I might think that just as the year is prolonged in case of emergency,¹⁵ so the month may be prolonged to meet an emergency; therefore it says, This month is for you the head of months,¹⁶ [which implies], See [the moon] like this and then sanctify!¹⁷ — Raba replied: There is no contradiction: in the once case we speak of prolonging the month, in the other of sanctifying it,¹⁸ and what [the above teaching] meant is this: I might say that just as the year is prolonged to meet an emergency, so the month may be sanctified to meet an emergency, therefore it says, 'This month is for you'; See [the moon] like this, and then sanctify. This is illustrated by the dictum of R. Joshua b. Levi: 'Witnesses¹⁹ can be intimidated [to withhold the report of] the new moon which has appeared in its due time²⁰ in order that the month may be

prolonged,²¹ but they may not be intimidated into reporting the new moon which has not appeared in its proper time in order that a New Moon may be sanctified [on the thirtieth]'. Is this so? Did not R. Judah the Prince²² send to R. Ammi a message saying: Know that when R. Johanan was alive he used to teach us that witnesses may be intimidated into reporting [on the thirtieth day] the new moon which has not appeared in its due time, in order that the New Moon may be sanctified, and even though they have not seen it they may say, We have seen it? — Abaye said: There is no contradiction: the one rule²³ holds good for Nisan and Tishri, the other for the other months of the year.²⁴ Raba said: This teaching which Rabbah b. Samuel learnt follows the 'Others', as it has been taught: 'Others say that between one Pentecost and another and between one New Year and 'another there are always four days [of the week] difference, or, if it was a leap year, five'.²⁵ R. Dimi from Nehardea reports the teaching in the reverse form: 'Witnesses can be intimidated to report [on the thirtieth day] the appearance of the moon which has not appeared in its proper time, in order that the month may be sanctified, but they may not be intimidated to withhold the report of the new moon which has been seen at its proper time in order that the month may be prolonged. What is the reason?

-
- (1) Since the New Moon can be fixed without actual observation.
 - (2) Even though the observation is not necessary for the purpose.
 - (3) I.e., in all such cases we can make Adar thirty days, and if the watchers have seen the new moon on Sabbath, they need not report till the next day.
 - (4) Hence we do not make New Moon on the thirtieth day, the new moon not yet having been observed, and it is not permitted to make it on the thirty-second.
 - (5) I.e., so that the sacrifice for New Moon should be offered at the proper time.
 - (6) But, as in the case of all the others, to secure that the New Moon offering should be brought on the proper day.
 - (7) Seeing that the observation makes no difference.
 - (8) Lit., 'this is a confutation'.
 - (9) So as to prevent Sabbath and a festival falling on successive days.
 - (10) Which would become stale if kept over two days. Vegetables eaten raw are referred to, and of course, there could be no plucking on Sabbath or Festivals.
 - (11) Which would commence to decompose if kept over two days.
 - (12) Which would be required on the second of the holy days.
 - (13) Lit., 'the world is oppressive for us'. In Palestine vegetables or dead bodies could be kept for two days.
 - (14) That a month may be prolonged to prevent inconvenience to the public. Lit. 'It is not so?'
 - (15) E.g., to make Passover fall in the season of new corn., v. Sanh. 11b.
 - (16) Ex. XII, 2.
 - (17) The word 'this' is interpreted to mean that God showed Moses the new moon as a model for all future time
 - (18) V. infra.
 - (19) Men sent out by the Beth din to watch for the appearance of the new moon from points of vantage.
 - (20) I.e., on the thirtieth day.
 - (21) Over the thirtieth day and the next New Moon declared on the thirty-first, which shows that the month can be prolonged in case of need.
 - (22) The grandson of Rabbi.
 - (23) That the month may be sanctified to meet a special need.
 - (24) A 'special need' might arise in the other months of the year if, for instance, eight months in a year (which was the maximum) had already been made 'full' and in the next month the moon did not appear on the thirtieth: v. 'Ar. 8b.
 - (25) V. p. 21, nn. 12, 13, and note. For this to happen the months would have to follow the moon strictly.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 20b

— The latter statement would be seen to be false,¹ the former statement is not seen to be false.²

Samuel said: I am quite able to make a calendar³ for the whole of the Diaspora. Said Abba the father of R. Simlai to Samuel: Does the Master know [the meaning] of this remark which occurs in

[the Baraitha known as] the secret of the Calendar?⁴ ‘If the new moon is born before midday or after midday?’ — He replied: I do not. He then said to him: Since the Master does not know this, there must also be other things which the Master does not know. When R. Zera went up [to Palestine], he sent back word to them [in Babylon]: It is necessary that there should be [on New Moon] a night and a day of the new moon.⁵ This is what Abba the father of R. Simlai meant: ‘We calculate [according to] the new moon's birth. If it is born before midday, then certainly it will have been seen shortly before sunset. If it was not born before midday, certainly it will not have been seen shortly before sunset’. What is the practical value of this remark? — R. Ashi said: To [help us in] confuting the witnesses.⁶

R. Zera said in the name of R. Nahman: The moon is invisible for twenty-four hours [round about new moon]. For us [in Babylon] six of these belong to the old moon and eighteen to the new;⁷ for them [in Palestine] six to the new and eighteen to the old.⁸ What is the practical value of this remark? — R. Ashi said: To confute the witnesses.

The Master has just said: It is necessary that there should be [on New Moon] a night and a day of the new moon. Whence is this rule derived? — R. Johanan said: [From the text]. From evening to evening;⁹ Resh Lakish said: [From the text], Until the twenty-first day of the month in the evening.¹⁰ What practical difference is there between them? — Abaye said: The difference between them is only one of exegesis.¹¹ Raba said: They differ in regard to [the hours up to] midnight.¹²

R. Zera said in the name of R. Nahman: Wherever [an extra day is kept] out of doubt, we make it the succeeding day.¹³ This means to say that we keep [Passover and Tabernacles] on the fifteenth and sixteenth but not on the fourteenth.¹⁴ But should not the fourteenth also be kept, in case both Ab and Elul¹⁵ have been declared short?¹⁶

(1) Because other people might have seen the new moon.

(2) Because it could not be proved that they had not seen it (Rashi). R. Hananel: Provided they had seen a semblance of the new moon].

(3) Heb. עָבַר lit., ‘taking across’: the word used for the prolonging of the year and the month.

(4) This was a Baraitha made up of enigmatic sentences like the one which follows.

(5) I.e., that there should be no appearance of the old moon in this period, viz., after the closing of the twenty-ninth day; otherwise New Moon cannot be proclaimed on the thirtieth.

(6) Because if the conjunction is calculated to have been after midday and they claim to have seen the new moon before nightfall, they are not telling the truth.

(7) Which would imply that in Babylon the new moon is not visible till eighteen hours after its birth (Rashi).

(8) Which would imply that in Palestine the new moon is visible six hours after its birth (Rashi).

(9) Lev. XXIII, 32, in connection with fasting on the Day of Atonement. This shows that the day follows the night in reference to the festivals.

(10) Ex. XII, 18, in connection with eating unleavened bread on Passover. This shows that the festivals end at even.

(11) Lit., ‘the interpretation of exegeses’.

(12) According to R. Johanan, the ‘night’ referred to is on the same footing as the night of the Day of Atonement which commences at nightfall. But according to Resh Lakish, it is on a par with the first night of Passover, which, in relation to the Paschal lamb, was a continuation of the afternoon before. Hence Resh Lakish holds that even if the old moon was seen in the early part of the evening, the next day may still be declared New Moon.

(13) Lit., ‘wherever there is a doubt, we cast it forward’.

(14) I.e., that we reckon fifteen days from the thirtieth day, and also from the thirty-first day of the previous Adar or Elul, out of doubt, but in no case from the twenty-ninth. This dictum would seem to be superfluous, as in no circumstances was New Moon proclaimed on the twenty-ninth day after the previous New Moon.

(15) Rashi reads ‘Shebat’.

(16) And in this case, what we suppose to have been the twenty-ninth day of Adar or of Elul would really have been the first of Nisan or of Tishri.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 21a

— If two [successive] months¹ are declared short, the thing becomes known.

Levi once arrived in Babylon on the eleventh of Tishri.² He said [to the people there]: How good and sweet is the dish of the Babylonians on the great day of the West.³ They said to him, Testify [that this is the tenth day].⁴ He replied: I did not [personally] hear the Beth din [in Jerusalem proclaim] ‘sanctified’.⁵

R. Johanan issued a proclamation: ‘In all those places which can be reached by the messengers sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out in Tishri,⁶ two days should be kept [on Passover],⁷ Nisan being included so that there should be no mistake as to Tishri’.⁸

R. Aibu b. Nagri and R. Hiyya b. Abba once arrived at a certain place which had been reached by the messengers sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out in Tishri, and though the inhabitants kept only one day [of Passover] they did not reprove them. When R. Johanan heard this he was annoyed and said to them: Did I not tell you that in places which have been reached by the messengers sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out in Tishri they should keep two days, Nisan being included so that no mistake should be made in Tishri?

Rabbah was accustomed to fast two days [on the Day of Atonement].⁹ Once he was found to be right.¹⁰ R. Nahman had once fasted the whole of the Day of Atonement, when in the evening a man came and told him, To-morrow is the great day in the West. He said to him, Whence are you? He replied, From Damharia.¹¹ ‘Blood will be his latter end’¹² he ejaculated, applying to himself the verse, Swift were our pursuers.¹³

R. Huna b. Abin sent an instruction to Raba: When you see that the cycle of Tebeth¹⁴ extends to the sixteenth of Nisan,¹⁵ declare that year¹⁶ a leap year and have no scruples,¹⁷ since it is written, Observe the month [hodesh] of Abib,¹⁸ which signifies, See to it that the Abib of the cycle¹⁹ should commence in the earlier half [hodesh]²⁰ of Nisan.

R. Nahman said to those who were going to sea: As you will not know when New Moon is fixed, [I will tell you what to do]. When you see the moon ceases shining with daylight,²¹ clear away leaven [for Passover]. When does it so shine? On the fifteenth [of the month]. But we clear away leaven on the fourteenth? — For them, as they had a clear view,²² the moon commenced to shine into the day from the fourteenth.

(1) Viz., (apparently) Ab and Elul, or Tebeth and Shebat. Rashi: Tebeth and Tammuz are always, according to the principles of fixed calendar, defective, and if Shebat’ which follows Tebeth, Ab and Tammuz were also to be defective, it would have become known to the Diaspora before the advent of the festivals.

(2) I.e., according to the reckoning of the Babylonians who were not aware that the previous month had been prolonged in Palestine by one day. He either came from near the frontier or just before nightfall, before they had broken their fast (v. Tosaf. s.v. **וי**).

(3) I.e., this is the Day of Atonement in Palestine, and you are eating, or you are ready to break your fast, cf. p. 86, n. 10.

(4) And we will keep this day too.

(5) I.e., that the day was sanctified as New Moon and therefore he could not testify, although he knew from independent sources that this was only ten days before, v. infra 21b. [MS.M.: ‘(proclaim)’, ‘prolonged’ **מעובר** instead of **מקודש**].

(6) The messengers sent out from Jerusalem to announce the New Moon of Nisan would be able to travel further by Passover than the messengers sent out in Tishri would be able to travel by Tabernacles, because the latter would lose two days on New Year and the Day of Atonement, when it was forbidden to travel.

- (7) Although the inhabitants would know when the New Moon of Nisan had been proclaimed.
- (8) I.e., if they kept Passover only one day, they might come to keep Tabernacles only one day.
- (9) Being uncertain whether the month of Elul, which normally consisted of twenty-nine days, had not been prolonged by the Beth din in Jerusalem.
- (10) Lit., 'it was found (to be) according to him'.
- (11) [Damar S.W. of Sura. V. Obermeyer p. 298.]
- (12) Heb. Dam tehi Aharitho — a play on the name Damharia.
- (13) Lam. IV, 19.
- (14) V. supra p. 30, n. 5.
- (15) Inclusive. V. Tosaf. s.v.
- (16) In other words, if the vernal equinox is known by calculation to fall after the sixteenth of Nisan a leap year is proclaimed.
- (17) Although this follows the view only of an individual authority, as recorded in Sanh. 13b.
- (18) Deut. XVI, 1.
- (19) I.e., the beginning of the vernal equinox. The day on which the vernal equinox begins is called Abib because on that day the corn begins to ripen by the effects of the sun (Rashi). V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 60 notes.
- (20) Lit., 'newness'. I.e., the first fourteen days. The New Moon of Nisan must be timed so that this can take place.
- (21) Lit., 'completing (its course) by day'.
- (22) Lit., 'as the world was revealed to them'.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 21b

MISHNAH. FOR THE SAKE OF TWO MONTHS SABBATH MAY BE PROFANED,¹ NAMELY, NISAN AND TISHRI, SINCE IN THEM MESSENGERS GO FORTH TO SYRIA AND IN THEM THE DATES OF THE FESTIVALS ARE FIXED.² WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS STANDING THEY USED TO PROFANE SABBATH FOR ALL THE MONTHS, IN ORDER THAT THE SACRIFICE [OF NEW MOON] MIGHT BE OFFERED ON THE RIGHT DAY.³

GEMARA. [Do messengers go forth] for two months only? The following was cited as conflicting with this: 'Messengers go forth to proclaim six months'!⁴ — Abaye replied: What is meant is this: For all [the other months] the messengers set out while it is still night,⁵ but for Nisan and Tishri they do not set out till they have heard the Beth din proclaim, 'sanctified'.⁶

It has been taught to the same effect: 'For all [the other months] they [the messengers] went forth while it was still night, but for Nisan and Tishri not until they had heard the Beth din proclaim 'sanctified'.

Our Rabbis taught: How do we know [from the Scripture] that Sabbath may be profaned on account of these? Because it says, These are the appointed seasons of the Lord . . . which ye shall proclaim in their appointed season.⁷ I might say then that just as it may be profaned until they [the months] are sanctified, so it may be profaned [further] until they are promulgated?⁸ Not so, since it says, 'which ye shall proclaim:' for their proclamation you may profane the Sabbath, but not for their promulgation.⁹

WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS STANDING THEY USED TO PROFANE SABBATH FOR ALL THE MONTHS, IN ORDER THAT THE SACRIFICE MIGHT BE OFFERED ON THE RIGHT DAY. Our Rabbis taught : Originally the Sabbath could be profaned for all of them. When the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said to them [the Beth din], Is there then a sacrifice [waiting to be brought]? They therefore ordained that Sabbath should not be profaned save for Nisan and Tishri alone.¹⁰

MISHNAH. WHETHER [THE NEW MOON] HAS BEEN SEEN CLEARLY¹¹ OR HAS NOT

BEEN SEEN CLEARLY, SABBATH MAY BE PROFANED ON ACCOUNT OF IT. R. JOSE SAYS, HOWEVER, THAT IF IT HAS BEEN SEEN CLEARLY SABBATH IS NOT TO BE PROFANED ON ACCOUNT OF IT.¹² IT HAPPENED ONCE THAT MORE THAN FORTY PAIRS OF WITNESSES WERE ON THEIR WAY¹³ [TO JERUSALEM] AND R. AKIBA DETAINED THEM IN LYDDA. R. GAMALIEL THEREUPON SENT TO HIM SAYING: IF YOU PREVENT THE MULTITUDE [FROM COMING TO GIVE EVIDENCE] YOU WILL PROVE TO BE THE CAUSE OF THEIR STUMBLING IN THE TIME TO COME.¹⁴

GEMARA. How do we know that the word 'alil here means 'clear'? — R. Abbahu replied: Because the Scripture says, The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in the clear sight [ba-'alil] of the earth, refined seven times.¹⁵

Rab and Samuel [gave different interpretations of a certain text]. One said: Fifty gates of understanding were created in the world, and all were given to Moses save one, as it says, Yet thou hast made him but little lower than a God,¹⁶ Now, Koheleth sought to find out words of delight.¹⁷ [That is to say,] Koheleth sought to be like Moses, but a bath kol¹⁸ went forth and said to him, It is written uprightly even words of truth,¹⁹ 'There arose not a prophet again in Israel like Moses'.²⁰ The other said: Among the prophets there arose not, but among the kings there did arise. How then do I interpret the words, Koheleth sought to find out words of delight? Koheleth sought to pronounce verdicts from his own insight,²¹ without witnesses and without warning,²² whereupon a bath kol went forth and said, It is written uprightly even words of truth, 'At the mouth of two witnesses' etc.²³

(1) By witnesses who have seen the new moon, in order that they may give information in Jerusalem at the earliest possible moment. V. supra.

(2) It is difficult to see what reason this furnishes for allowing the witnesses to break the Sabbath. Rashi explains that if the witnesses are not allowed to bring the news on Sabbath, the New Moon will not be sanctified till Sunday, and so the messengers instead of setting out as soon as Sabbath is over will not set out till several hours later, and this might make them late in some places in giving notice of the date of Passover. V. Rashi and Tosaf.

(3) Lit., 'for the proper adjustment of the sacrifice'.

(4) I.e., whenever the month is lengthened to thirty days.

(5) On the thirty-first day, since it is already certain that New Moon will be on this day.

(6) Which would be at some hour in the daytime.

(7) Lev. XXIII, 4. Stress is laid on the words 'in their appointed season'.

(8) I. e., to the Diaspora, by the messengers.

(9) I. e., the witnesses may profane, but not the messengers.

(10) On account of their extra sanctity.

(11) Lit., 'in an 'alil'. V. Gemara infra.

(12) There being no necessity, as many people will have seen it.

(13) Lit., 'were passing'.

(14) As people will be reluctant to come to give evidence.

(15) Ps. XII, 7. E.V. 'in a crucible'.

(16) Ps. VIII, 6. E.V. 'than the angels'.

(17) Eccl. XII, 10.

(18) A voice from heaven, V. Glos.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Deut. XXXIV, 10.

(21) Lit., 'that are in the heart'. [Omitted in MS.M.].

(22) The forewarning required by law for the punishment of an offender.

(23) Deut. XIX, 15.

IT HAPPENED ONCE THAT MORE THEN FORTY PAIRS [OF WITNESSES] WERE ON THEIR WAY [TO JERUSALEM] AND R. AKIBA DETAINED THEM etc. It has been taught: R. Judah said: Far be it from us to think that R. Akiba detained them. It was Shazpar the head of Geder¹ who detained them, and Rabban Gamaliel thereupon sent and they deposed him from his office.²

MISHNAH. IF A FATHER AND A SON HAVE SEEN THE NEW MOON, THEY SHOULD BOTH GO [TO JERUSALEM], NOT THAT THEY CAN ACT AS JOINT WITNESSES³ BUT SO THAT IF ONE OF THEM IS DISQUALIFIED⁴ THE OTHER MAY JOIN WITH SOME OTHER WITNESS. R. SIMEON, HOWEVER, SAYS THAT A FATHER AND SON AND ALL RELATIVES ARE ELIGIBLE TO TESTIFY TO THE APPEARANCE OF THE NEW MOON. R. JOSE SAID: IT HAPPENED ONCE WITH TOBIAH THE PHYSICIAN THAT HE SAW THE NEW MOON IN JERUSALEM ALONG WITH HIS SON AND HIS EMANCIPATED SLAVE, AND THE PRIESTS ACCEPTED HIS EVIDENCE AND THAT OF HIS SON AND DISQUALIFIED HIS SLAVE, BUT WHEN THEY APPEARED BEFORE THE BETH DIN THEY ACCEPTED HIS EVIDENCE AND THAT OF HIS SLAVE AND DISQUALIFIED HIS SON.

GEMARA. R. Levi said: What is the reason of R. Simeon? — Because it is written, and the Lord spoke unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months,⁵ which implies, ‘this testimony shall be valid [when given] by you’.⁶ And the Rabbis? — [It implies], this evidence shall be entrusted to you.⁷

R. JOSE SAID, IT HAPPENED ONCE WITH TOBIAH THE PHYSICIAN etc. R. Hanan b. Raba said: The law⁸ is as stated by R. Simeon. Said R. Huna to R. Hanan b. Raba, We have R. Jose and an incident [on the other side], and you say that the law is as stated by R. Simeon! — He replied: Many times I said in the presence of Rab, ‘The law is as stated by R. Simeon’, and he did not correct me.⁹ He then asked him, How did you repeat [the Mishnah]? — He [R. Hanan] replied [I repeated it to him with the names] reversed.¹⁰ He [R. Huna] thereupon said to him, That was the reason why Rab did not correct you. Tabi said in the name of Mari Tabi who had it from Mar ‘Ukba: The law is as stated by R. Simeon.

MISHNAH THE FOLLOWING ARE INELIGIBLE: GAMBLER,¹¹ USURERS, PIGEON-FLYERS,¹² THOSE WHO TRAFFIC IN PRODUCE OF THE SABBATHICAL YEAR,¹³ AND SLAVES. IT IS A GENERAL RULE THAT FOR ANY TESTIMONY FOR WHICH A WOMAN IS DISQUALIFIED THESE ALSO ARE DISQUALIFIED.

GEMARA. I infer from this that any testimony which a woman is qualified to give¹⁴ they are also qualified to give. R. Ashi said: This is equivalent to saying that one who is Rabbinically¹⁵ accounted a robber is qualified to give the same evidence as a woman.

MISHNAH. IF ONE WHO HAS SEEN THE MOON IS NOT ABLE TO GO ON FOOT, HE MAY BE BROUGHT ON AN ASS OR EVEN IN A LITTER [ON SABBATH]. IF THEY [THE WITNESSES] ARE LIKELY TO BE WAYLAID,¹⁶ THEY MAY TAKE CUDGELS [TO DEFEND THEMSELVES].¹⁷ IF THE DISTANCE IS GREAT [TO JERUSALEM], THEY MAY TAKE PROVISIONS WITH THEM, SINCE FOR AS MUCH AS A NIGHT AND A DAY'S JOURNEY¹⁸ THEY WERE ALLOWED TO PROFANE SABBATH AND GO FORTH TO TESTIFY TO THE APPEARANCE OF THE NEW MOON, AS IT SAYS: THESE ARE THE APPOINTED SEASONS OF THE LORD . . . WHICH YE SHALL PROCLAIM IN THEIR APPOINTED SEASON.¹⁹

CHAPTER II

MISHNAH. IF THAT ONE²⁰ IS NOT KNOWN TO THEM [THE BETH DIN IN JERUSALEM], THEY [THE BETH DIN OF HIS OWN PLACE] SEND ANOTHER WITH HIM TO CERTIFY

HIM [AS RELIABLE]. ORIGINALLY TESTIMONY WITH REGARD TO [THE APPEARANCE OF] THE NEW MOON WAS RECEIVED FROM ANYONE. WHEN, HOWEVER, THE BOETHUSIANS²¹ ADOPTED EVIL COURSES, IT WAS ORDAINED THAT TESTIMONY SHOULD BE RECEIVED ONLY FROM PERSONS KNOWN [TO THE BETH DIN].

GEMARA. What is meant by ANOTHER? [I would naturally suppose], one other person.

- (1) [Gederah in Judah. V. Josh. XV, 36].
- (2) Lit., 'greatness'.
- (3) Near relatives being disqualified from offering evidence together.
- (4) I.e., found by the Beth din to be unreliable.
- (5) Ex. XII, 1, 2.
- (6) Even if you are near relatives.
- (7) The communal leaders, to sanctify the month on the strength of it. Nothing, however, is implied about relatives.
- (8) [MS.M. 'the Halachah' and so in all other cases in this passage].
- (9) Lit., 'he did not say anything to me'.
- (10) I.e., saying that R. Jose declared a father and son to be eligible, and that R. Simeon related the incident.
- (11) Lit., 'those who play with dice'.
- (12) For wagers.
- (13) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 142, nn. 3-5.
- (14) E.g., to testify the death of a husband so as to enable the widow to remarry.
- (15) Like those mentioned above, who are not accounted robbers according to the strict letter of the Pentateuch, since although they acquire money wrongfully they do not take anything by force: v. Yeb. 25a
- (16) Lit., 'if there are lyers-in-wait for them'.
- (17) Although it was forbidden to carry on Sabbath.
- (18) If the distance was much larger there would be no point in their evidence since in the absence of witnesses the New Moon is on the first day.
- (19) Lev. XXIII, 4. V. supra, p. 89. n. 5.
- (20) V. Gemara, infra.
- (21) The followers of a certain Boethus, who seems to have lived in the second century B.C.E. Like the Sadducees, they rejected the Oral Law and opposed the Rabbis. [MS.M. 'Minim' (v. Glos. s.v. Min.)]

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 22b

But [is the word of] one person to be taken? Has it not been taught, 'On one occasion he came accompanied by the witnesses¹ who were to testify to his bona fides'? — R. Papa replied: What is meant by ANOTHER? Another pair. This view too is borne out by an examination [of the language of the Mishnah]. For should you hold otherwise, [consider the words] IF THAT ONE [OTHO] IS NOT KNOWN TO THEM. Now what is referred to by THAT ONE? Shall I say, a single person? But is [the word of] one person accepted,² seeing that the word judgment³ is used in connection with it? But in fact what is meant by THAT ONE? That pair. So here, what is meant by ANOTHER? Another pair.

But is not the word of one witness taken [in this matter]? Has it not been taught, 'On one occasion R. Nehorai accompanied the witness to testify to his bona fides on Sabbath in Usha'⁴ — I can reply that there was another witness along with R. Nehorai, and the reason why he was not mentioned was out of respect for R. Nehorai.⁵ R. Ashi said: In R. Nehorai's case there was [already] another witness in Usha,⁶ and R. Nehorai went to join his testimony with his. If that is the case, what is the point of the statement?⁷ — You might think that we do not allow the Sabbath to be profaned [by one witness] where there is any doubt [about the other].⁸ Hence we are told [that this is not so].

When 'Ulla came [to Babylon], he announced that they had sanctified the New Moon [on a certain

day] in the West [Palestine]. Said R. Kahana: Not only [in such a case] do we take the word of 'Ulla who is a great man, but we take the word of any ordinary man. What is the reason? Because whenever a thing is bound to come to light later on, men do not lie about it. It has been taught to the same effect: If a man comes from the other end of the world and says, The Beth din have sanctified the New Moon, his word is taken.

ORIGINALLY TESTIMONY WITH REGARD TO THE APPEARANCE OF THE NEW MOON WAS RECEIVED FROM ANYONE. Our Rabbis taught: What evil course did the Boethusians⁹ adopt? Once the Boethusians sought to mislead the Sages.¹⁰ They hired two men for four hundred zuzim, one belonging to our party and one to theirs. The one of their party gave his evidence and departed. Our man [came and] they said to him: Tell us how you saw the moon. He replied: I was going up the ascent of Adumim¹¹ and I saw it couched between two rocks, its head like [that of] a calf, its ears like [those of] a hind, and its tail lying between its legs, and as I caught sight of it I got a fright and fell backwards, and if you do not believe me, why, I have two hundred zuzim tied up in my cloak. They said to him: Who told you to say all this?¹² He replied: I heard that the Boethusians were seeking to mislead the Sages, so I said [to myself], I will go myself and tell them, for fear lest untrustworthy men should come and mislead the Sages. They said: You can have the two hundred zuzim as a present,¹³ and the man who hired you shall be laid out on the post.¹⁴ There and then they ordained that testimony should be received only from persons who were known to them.

MISHNAH. ORIGINALLY THEY USED TO LIGHT¹⁵ BEACONS.¹⁶ WHEN THE CUTHEANS [SAMARITANS] ADOPTED EVIL COURSES,¹⁷ THEY MADE A RULE THAT MESSENGERS SHOULD GO FORTH. HOW DID THEY LIGHT THE BEACONS? THEY USED TO BRING LONG POLES OF CEDAR AND REEDS AND OLIVE WOOD AND FLAX FLUFF WHICH THEY TIED TO THE POLES WITH A STRING, AND SOMEONE USED TO GO UP TO THE TOP OF A MOUNTAIN AND SET FIRE TO THEM AND WAVE THEM TO AND FRO AND UP AND DOWN UNTIL HE SAW THE NEXT ONE DOING THE SAME THING ON THE TOP OF THE SECOND MOUNTAIN; AND SO ON THE TOP OF THE THIRD MOUNTAIN. WHENCE DID THEY CARRY THE [CHAIN OF] BEACONS? FROM THE MOUNT OF OLIVES [IN JERUSALEM] TO SARTABA, AND FROM SARTABA TO GROFINA, AND FROM GROFINA TO HAURAN, AND FROM HAURAN TO BETH BALTIN.¹⁸ THE ONE ON BETH BALTIN DID NOT BUDGE FROM THERE BUT WENT ON WAVING TO AND FRO AND UP AND DOWN UNTIL HE SAW THE WHOLE OF THE DIASPORA¹⁹ BEFORE HIM LIKE ONE BONFIRE.²⁰

GEMARA. How do we know that the word *massi'ir*²¹ connotes 'burning'? — Because it is written in the Scripture, *wa-yisa'em, David and his men*,²² and we translate²³ 'and David burnt them'.

Our Rabbis taught 'Beacon fires are lit only for the new moon which has been seen at its proper time,²⁴ [to announce that] it has been sanctified. When are they lit? On the night following its announcement.²⁵ This means to say that we light beacons for defective months but not for full months. What is the reason? — R. Zera said: It is a precaution on account of a defective month which ends on Friday. [In that case] when do we light? On the termination of Sabbath; and if you were to insist that we should light up also for full months, this might give rise

(1) This would show that at least two were required.

(2) In giving evidence regarding the New Moon.

(3) In the verse, For it is a statute for Israel, a judgment for the God of Jacob. Ps. LXXXI, 5. 'Judgment' could be delivered only on the evidence of at least two witnesses.

(4) At the time when the Beth din was in Usha.

(5) I.e., so as not to put him on the same footing as R. Nehorai. Cf. Git. 5b for a similar incident.

(6) This witness may have been either one who had seen the new moon, or one who could testify to the bona fides of the

man who has seen it. V. Tosaf. s.v. **סדרא**.

(7) What reason was there why R. Nehorai should not have gone on Sabbath, seeing that the Mishnah permits this?

(8) Who might disappear in the interval.

(9) [MS.M.: Minim, v. supra p. 94, n. 2].

(10) By making them believe that the new moon had been seen on the thirtieth of Adar, which was a Sabbath, when in fact it had not, so that the second day of Passover might be on a Sunday and the counting of the 'Omer might commence literally 'on the morrow of the Sabbath', according to their interpretation of the words (Rashi).

(11) V. Josh. XV, 7.

(12) Lit., 'who compelled you to all this'.

(13) Beth din having the right to expropriate. [On the reading Minim, if the reference is to Jewish Christians, their desire to have the first day of Passover fall on Friday and Pentecost on Sunday as was the case in the year of the crucifixion, would supply them with a reason for tampering with the Calendar, V. Herford, Christianity in the Talmud, p. 330.]

(14) For a flogging.

(15) The Hebrew word is massi'in, which literally means 'raise up'.

(16) To convey the news of the New Moon to the diaspora in Babylon.

(17) And lit beacons on the thirtieth day, so as to mislead the Babylonians.

(18) [There is no general agreement about the identification of these places. Obermeyer (p. 17ff) locates them as follows: Sartaba == Karn Sartaba, five km from the western bank of the Jordan; Grofina (or 'Agrufina, v. D.S.) 'Arafun, a hill situated among the Gilead range of mountains; Hauran south of Damascus, cf. Ezek. XLVII, 18. Beth Baltin == Beiram (v. infra) some miles N.W. of Pumbeditha. For other views, v. Horowitz Palestine, p. 125].

(19) I.e., the district of Pumbeditha. V. Gemara. [Rashi omits 'the whole of'.]

(20) Because, as explained infra in the Gemara, the inhabitants on seeing the beacon fire used to light torches.

(21) V. supra p. 96, n. 5.

(22) 2 Sam., V, 21 in reference to the idols captured from the Philistines. E.V. 'took them away'.

(23) In the authorized Aramaic version.

(24) I.e., on the thirtieth day of the outgoing month.

(25) **יום עיבור**, 'the day of the prolongation'. V. supra, p. 81, n. 1.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 23a

to confusion, since people would say: This month may be defective, and the reason why beacons were not lit yesterday is because it was impossible,¹ or perhaps it is full and they are lighting up at the proper time. But why should we not light up whether for a full month or a defective month, and when New Moon is on Friday not light up at all, so that since we do not light at the termination of Sabbath, in spite of the fact that we usually light for a full month, people will know that it is defective? — This nevertheless may lead to errors, since people will say, This month is full, and the reason why they have not lit up is because they have been prevented.² But why not light up for the full months and not at all for the defective months? — Abaye replied: So as not to deprive the public of two working days.³

HOW DID THEY LIGHT THE BEACONS? THEY USED TO BRING LONG POLES etc. Rab Judah said: There are four kinds of cedar — cedar, kedros,⁴ pinewood⁵ and cypress [What is] kedros? — R. Idra stated that in the school of R. Shila it was defined as mabliga,⁶ though others held that it is gulmish. He [Rab Judah] differs herein from Rabbah son of R. Huna; for Rabbah son of R. Huna reported that in the school of Rab it was stated that there are ten kinds of cedar, as it says, I will plant in the wilderness erez, shitah, and hadas and oil-tree, I will set in the desert berosh, tidhor and teashur together.⁷ 'Erez' is cedar; 'shitah' is pine; 'hadas' is myrtle; 'oil-tree' is balsam; berosh is cypress; tidhor is teak;⁸ teashur is larch.⁹ This makes seven. When R. Dimi came, he said: To these were added alonim, almonim, and almugim. 'Alonim' are terebinths; almonim are oaks; almugim are coral-wood. According to others it should be aronim, 'armonim, and almugim. Aronim are bay-trees; 'armonim are planes; almugim are coral-wood.

Neither shall gallant ship pass thereby.¹⁰ Rab said: This refers to the great ship.¹¹ How is it carried out?¹² They bring there six thousand men for twelve months (or according to others twelve thousand men for six months) and load the boat with sand until it rests on the sea-bottom.¹³ Then a diver goes down and ties a rope of flax to the coral while the other end is tied to the ship, and the sand is then taken and thrown overboard, and as the boat rises it pulls up the coral with it. The coral is worth twice its weight in silver. There were three ports, two belonging to the Romans¹⁴ and one belonging to the Persians. From the Roman side they brought up coral, from the Persian side pearls. This [the Persian] one was called the port of Mashmahig.¹⁵

R. Johanan said: Every acacia tree that was taken by the invaders from Jerusalem will be restored to it by the Holy One, blessed be He, in time to come, as it says, I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia tree,¹⁶ and ‘wilderness’ means Jerusalem, as it is written, Zion is become a wilderness¹⁷ etc.

R. Johanan further said: One who studies the Torah but does not teach it is like the myrtle in the wilderness.¹⁸ Others report [the saying thus]: One who studies the Torah and teaches it in a place where there is no [other] talmid hakam¹⁹ is like the myrtle in the wilderness, which is precious.

R. Johanan also said: Alas for the idol-worshippers since they have no means of remedy,²⁰ as it says, For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass and for stones iron.²¹ But what can they bring to replace R. Akiba and his companions? Of them the Scripture says, Though I cleanse them [of other transgressions] from their blood I shall not cleanse them.²²

WHENCE DID THEY CARRY THE CHAIN OF BEACONS etc.? FROM BETH BALTIM. What is Beth Baltin? — Rab said: This is

(1) On account of Sabbath.

(2) Through having drunk too much on Sabbath, and become intoxicated (Rashi).

(3) It was customary to abstain from work on New Moon (v. Tosaf. s.v. מִשּׁוֹם). In this case the thirtieth day would always be kept as New Moon from doubt, and if the actual day fixed was the thirty-first, there would be two days New Moon.

(4) Heb. קִדְרוֹם or קִתְרוֹם prob. ==GR.**.

(5) Lit., ‘oil (i.e., resinous) wood’.

(6) Prob. connected with the root זָלַג ‘to drip’.

(7) Isa. XLI, 19. E.V. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia tree, and the myrtle and the oil-tree, I will set in the desert the cypress, the plane-tree and the larch together. The Talmud proceeds to give the Aramaic equivalents of the Hebrew words.

(8) The Aramaic is shaga, of which the precise meaning is unknown.

(9) Aramaic shuribna, of which also the precise meaning is unknown.

(10) Isa. XXXIII, 21.

(11) Heb. בִּרְנִי prob. a corruption of GR.**, a light fast-sailing Liburnian vessel. [Supply here from MS.M.: ‘For what purpose is it made? — To raise with it corals’].

(12) Viz., the coral fishing in the Persian Gulf.

(13) The water being here rather shallow.

(14) [בִּי רוֹמַי so MS.M.; cur. edd. בִּי אַרְמַי Be Armae, the Hebrew equivalent of Suristan (the land of the Syrians) the name given to Babylon by the Sasamans; v. Funk, Monumenta, p. 16 and Obermeyer p. 74].

(15) [Rashi: ‘the port of the kingdom’. Fleischer (notes to Levy’s Dictionary): ‘name of an island in the Persian Gulf between ‘Oman and al-Bahrin.’]

(16) Isa. XLI, 19.

(17) Ibid. LXIV, 9.

(18) The fragrance of which is wasted.

(19) V. Glos.

(20) I.e., they will not be able to save themselves by remedying the wrong they have done.

(21) Isa. LX, 17.

(22) Joel IV, 21. E.V., And I will hold as innocent their blood that I have not held as innocent.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 23b

Biram.¹ What is meant here by DIASPORA [GOLAH]? — R. Joseph said: This is Pumbeditha. What is meant [then] by LIKE ONE BIG BONFIRE? — A Tanna taught: 'Every inhabitant [of Pumbeditha] takes a torch in his hand and goes up on to his roof'.² It has been taught: 'R. Simeon b. Eleazar says: [Beacon fires were lit] also on Harim and Kayir and Geder and the neighbouring places'.³ Some say that these places are between [those mentioned in the Mishnah].⁴ Others say that they are on the further side from the Land of Israel, and that one authority [the Mishnah] reckons the places on one side,⁵ and the other reckons the places on the other.⁶ R. Johanan said: Between each one and the next⁷ there were eight parasangs.⁸ How many [parasangs] then were there altogether? Thirty-two.⁹ But to-day there is much more? — Abaye said: The [direct] roads have been closed,¹⁰ as it is written, Therefore behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns [etc.].¹¹ R. Nahman b. Isaac said: It is stated in this verse, viz., He hath made my paths crooked.¹²

MISHNAH. THERE WAS A LARGE COURT IN JERUSALEM CALLED BETH YA'AZEK. THERE ALL THE WITNESSES USED TO ASSEMBLE AND THE BETH DIN USED TO EXAMINE THEM. THEY USED TO ENTERTAIN THEM LAVISHLY THERE¹³ SO THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE AN INDUCEMENT¹⁴ TO COME. ORIGINALLY THEY USED NOT TO LEAVE THE PLACE THE WHOLE DAY,¹⁵ BUT RABBAN GAMALIEL THE ELDER INTRODUCED A RULE THAT THEY COULD GO TWO THOUSAND CUBITS FROM IT IN ANY DIRECTION. THESE WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES [TO WHOM THIS CONCESSION WAS MADE]. A MIDWIFE WHO HAS COME [FROM A DISTANCE] TO HELP IN CHILDBIRTH OR ONE WHO COMES TO RESCUE FROM A FIRE OR FROM BANDITS OR FROM A RIVER IN FLOOD OR FROM A BUILDING THAT HAS FALLEN IN — ALL THESE ARE ON THE SAME FOOTING AS THE RESIDENTS OF THE TOWN, AND MAY GO TWO THOUSAND CUBITS [ON SABBATH] IN ANY DIRECTION.

GEMARA. The question was raised: Do we read here Beth Ya'azek or Beth Ya'zek? Do we read Beth Ya'azek, regarding the name as an elegancia¹⁶ based on the Scriptural expressions, And he ringed it round and cleared it of stones?¹⁷ Or do we read Beth Ya'zek, taking the name to connote constraint,¹⁸ as it is written, being bound in chains?¹⁹ — Abaye said: Come and hear [a proof that it is the former]: THEY USED TO ENTERTAIN THEM LAVISHLY THERE SO THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE AN INDUCEMENT TO COME. [This is not conclusive], as perhaps they treated them in both ways.²⁰

MISHNAH. HOW DO THEY TEST THE WITNESSES? THE PAIR WHO ARRIVE FIRST ARE TESTED FIRST. THE SENIOR OF THEM IS BROUGHT IN AND THEY SAY TO HIM, TELL US HOW YOU SAW THE MOON — IN FRONT OF THE SUN OR BEHIND THE SUN?²¹ TO THE NORTH OF IT OR THE SOUTH? HOW BIG WAS IT, AND IN WHICH DIRECTION WAS IT INCLINED?²² AND HOW BROAD WAS IT? IF HE SAYS [HE SAW IT] IN FRONT OF THE SUN, HIS EVIDENCE IS REJECTED.²³ AFTER THAT THEY WOULD BRING IN THE SECOND AND TEST HIM. IF THEIR ACCOUNTS TALLIED, THEIR EVIDENCE WAS ACCEPTED, AND THE OTHER PAIRS WERE ONLY QUESTIONED BRIEFLY,²⁴ NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE REQUIRED AT ALL, BUT SO THAT THEY SHOULD NOT BE DISAPPOINTED, [AND] SO THAT THEY SHOULD NOT BE DISSUADED FROM COMING.²⁵

GEMARA. 'IN FRONT OF THE SUN' is surely the same as 'TO THE NORTH OF IT', and 'BEHIND THE SUN' is surely the same as 'TO THE SOUTH OF IT'?²⁶ — Abaye said: [It means],

whether the concavity of the moon is in front of the sun or behind the sun.²⁷ If he says, in front of the sun, his evidence is rejected, since R. Johanan has said: What is meant by the verse, Dominion and fear are with him, He maketh peace in his high places?²⁸ Never did the sun behold the concavity of the new moon nor the concavity of the rainbow. It never sees the concavity of the moon, so that she should not feel humiliated.²⁹ It never sees the concavity of the rainbow so that the worshippers of the sun should not say,

-
- (1) Apparently some place between Syria and Mesopotamia; v. supra p. 97, n. 1.
- (2) To spread the news throughout Babylon.
- (3) [These places are likewise difficult to identify. For various attempts v. Horowitz loc. cit. Graetz, Geschichte p. 67, n. 1 emends on the basis of the Tosef. a.l. **חרים וכייר וגדר** into **הרי מכוור וגדר** the mountains of Macherus (in the south) and Gedera in the north. 'The neighbouring places' will include Tabor which is also mentioned in the Tosef.]
- (4) And therefore in Palestine.
- (5) Perhaps those nearer to Jerusalem.
- (6) Perhaps those nearer to Babylon. This reference in both cases is uncertain; v. Horowitz, Palestine, loc. cit.
- (7) Of those mentioned in the Mishnah.
- (8) About forty miles.
- (9) [Apparently from Mount of Olives to Beth Baltin, the last station in Palestine.]
- (10) And travellers are obliged to take a round about route.
- (11) Hos. II, 8. The verse continues, that she shall not find her paths.
- (12) Lam. III, 9.
- (13) Lit., 'they made for them large banquets'.
- (14) Lit., 'become accustomed to come'.
- (15) If they came on Sabbath, as they had already exceeded the limit of two thousand cubits.
- (16) Lit., 'an elevated' or 'refined expression', i.e., not belonging to the language of everyday life.
- (17) Isa. V, 2. E.V. 'and he digged it and cleared it'. The Heb. is **ויעזקהו** which the Talmud connects with the Aramaic **עזקה** 'a ring', so that Beth Ya'azek would refer to the stone wall round the court.
- (18) In allusion to the fact that they were (originally) confined to the courtyard the whole of the day. But cf. Tosaf. s.v. **אז**.
- (19) Jer. XL, 1. The Hebrew word is **באזיקים**.
- (20) I.e., both kindly and rigorously.
- (21) The meaning of this is discussed in the Gemara.
- (22) I.e., in which direction were the horns turning.
- (23) Lit., 'he has not said anything'.
- (24) Lit., 'with heads of subjects'.
- (25) Lit., 'so that they should (still) be accustomed to come'.
- (26) The new moon can be seen only about sunset, close to the sun, when the sun is travelling towards the north. We should therefore naturally take 'in front of the sun' to mean 'to the north of the sun', and 'behind the sun' to mean 'to the south of the sun'.
- (27) I.e., whether the rim of the moon visible from the earth is concave or convex in relation to the sun. By 'in front of' Abaye understands 'turned towards', and by 'behind', 'turned away from'.
- (28) Job XXV, 2.
- (29) And in this way God keeps the peace between the sun and the moon.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 24a

He is shooting arrows [at those who do not worship him].¹

HOW HIGH WAS IT AND IN WHICH DIRECTION WAS IT INCLINED. One Tanna taught: [If he says], To the north, his evidence is accepted; [if he says], To the south, his evidence is rejected.² But it has been taught to the opposite effect: '[If he says], To the south, his evidence is accepted; [if

he says], To the north, his evidence is rejected'? — There is no contradiction; one statement speaks of the dry season,³ the other of the rainy season.⁴

The Rabbis taught: If one⁵ says that it was two ox-loads high⁶ and the other three,⁷ their evidence is accepted. If one, however, says that it was three and the other five, their evidence is nullified, only each of them can be joined with another witness.⁸

Our Rabbis taught: '[If they say], We saw it in water, we saw it in a mirror, we saw it through the clouds, they are not allowed to testify concerning it. [If they say], We saw half of it in water, half of it through the clouds, half of it in a mirror, they are not allowed to testify concerning it'. Since you disallow them [when they see] the whole, can there be any question [when they see] only half? — In fact the statement should run as follows: '[If they say they saw] half of it in water and half in the sky, half of it through the clouds and half in the sky, half of it in a mirror and half in the sky, they are not allowed to testify.'

Our Rabbis taught: [If they say], We saw it [once], but did not see it again, they are not allowed to testify concerning it. [Why so?] Are they to go on seeing it the whole time? — Abaye replied: What is meant is this. [If they say], We saw it by chance,⁹ but when we came to look for it deliberately¹⁰ we could not see it, they are not allowed to testify concerning it. What is the reason? Because I might say, they saw only a circular disc in the clouds.

MISHNAH. THE HEAD OF THE BETH DIN SAYS, 'SANCTIFIED', AND ALL THE PEOPLE REPEAT AFTER HIM, 'SANCTIFIED, SANCTIFIED'. WHETHER THE NEW MOON IS SEEN AT ITS PROPER TIME¹¹ OR NOT AT ITS PROPER TIME, IN EITHER CASE [THE NEW MOON] IS SANCTIFIED.¹² R. ELEAZAR B. ZADOK, HOWEVER, SAYS THAT IF IT IS NOT SEEN AT ITS PROPER TIME [THE NEW MOON] IS NOT [FORMALLY] SANCTIFIED, BECAUSE HEAVEN HAS ALREADY SANCTIFIED IT.

GEMARA. THE HEAD OF THE BETH DIN etc. What is the Scriptural warrant for this? — R. Hiyya b. Gamda said in the name of R. Jose b. Saul, who had it from Rabbi: The Scripture says, And Moses declared the appointed seasons of the Lord;¹³ from this we learn that the head of the Beth din says, 'sanctified'.

AND ALL THE PEOPLE REPEAT AFTER HIM, 'SANCTIFIED, SANCTIFIED'. Whence do we learn this? — R. Papa said: Scripture says, which ye shall proclaim [them].¹⁴ [For otham] read attem.¹⁵ R. Nahman b. Isaac said, [we learn it from here]: Even these [hem] are my appointed seasons;¹⁶ [which implies], they shall say, my seasons.¹⁷

SANCTIFIED, SANCTIFIED: why twice? — Because it is written, holy convocations.¹⁸

R. ELEAZAR B. ZADOK SAYS THAT IF IT IS NOT SEEN AT ITS PROPER TIME IT IS NOT SANCTIFIED. It has been taught: Polemo says: If seen at its time it is not sanctified,¹⁹ if seen out of its time it is sanctified. R. Eleazar b. Simeon says: in either case it is not sanctified, since it says, And ye shall sanctify the fiftieth year,²⁰ which shows that you are to sanctify years, but are not to sanctify months.

Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel: The halachah is as laid down by R. Eleazar b. Zadok. Abaye said: We have also learnt to the same effect: 'If the Beth din and all Israel saw it,²¹ and if the witnesses had been tested, but they had no time to say 'sanctified' before it grew dark, the month is prolonged', which implies that it is prolonged²² but that [the new month] is not sanctified [later in the day]. [This is not conclusive, since] there was a special reason for mentioning the prolonging. You might think that since the Beth din and all Israel saw it [the new moon] everyone knew that it

had appeared and therefore the month should not be prolonged. Therefore we are told [that this is not so].

MISHNAH. R. GAMALIEL USED TO HAVE A DIAGRAM OF PHASES OF THE MOON ON A TABLET [HUNG] ON THE WALL OF HIS UPPER CHAMBER, AND HE USED TO SHOW THEM TO THE UNLEARNED AND SAY, DID IT LOOK LIKE THIS OR THIS?

GEMARA. Is this allowed, seeing that it is written, Ye shall not make with me,²³ which we interpret, 'Ye shall not make the likeness of my attendants'? — Abaye replied: The Torah forbade only those attendants of which it is possible to make copies,²⁴ as it has been taught: A man may not make a house in the form of the Temple, or an exedra in the form of the Temple hall,²⁵ or a court corresponding to the Temple court, or a table corresponding to the [sacred] table or a candlestick corresponding to the [sacred] candlestick, but he may make one

-
- (1) The rainbow in this case having the appearance of a bow bent by the sun against the earth.
 - (2) Reading this sentence in its present context, we must suppose it to mean, 'if he says, (it was inclined) to the north' etc. This is very difficult to understand, and it is much more natural to suppose that the words to be supplied are 'that he saw it', and that this sentence is to be connected with the words in the Mishnah TO THE NORTH OF IT OR TO THE SOUTH. So apparently it is taken by Rashi. V. Maharsha, ad loc.
 - (3) Lit., 'the days of the sun': the summer months.
 - (4) The new moon always appears due west. Hence in the summer months when the sun sets in the north-west it is south of the sun, and similarly in the winter months north of the sun.
 - (5) Apparently this means here, one of a pair of witnesses.
 - (6) I.e., above the horizon.
 - (7) If the preceding paragraph related to the inclination of the moon, it obviously should have followed this paragraph, which is another reason for transferring the last Mishnah heading to the beginning of this paragraph. V. n. 1.
 - (8) Who gives the same version as he does.
 - (9) Lit., 'of ourselves'.
 - (10) I.e., with the object of testifying.
 - (11) I.e., on the thirtieth day.
 - (12) On the thirtieth or the thirty-first day, as the case may be.
 - (13) Lev. XXIII, 44.
 - (14) Ibid. 4. Heb. אֹתָם .
 - (15) Lit., 'you', implying that the public should join in the proclamation.
 - (16) Ibid. 2.
 - (17) The word הֵם 'they', being superfluous.
 - (18) Ibid. The Hebrew word is מִקְרָאִי , 'callings' or 'proclamings', the plural implying at least two.
 - (19) Since there is no need to impress its sanctity on the public.
 - (20) Lev. XXV, 10.
 - (21) On the thirtieth day.
 - (22) I.e., New Moon is not declared till the thirty-first day.
 - (23) Ex. XX, 20.
 - (24) Lit., 'like them'. Out of the same or other materials.
 - (25) Ulam, the hall leading to the interior of the Temple, v. Mid. IV, 7. All exedra had only three sides, but since the fourth side of the Temple hall had a very wide entrance it is not counted. V. Tosaf. a.l.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 24b

with five or six or eight lamps, but with seven he should not make, even of other metals.¹ R. Jose b. Judah said: He should not make one even of wood, this being the way in which the kings of the house of the Hasmoneans made it.² They said to him: Can you adduce this as a proof? The spits³ were of iron and they overlaid them with tin.⁴ When they grew richer they made them of silver.

When they grew richer still, they made them of gold.

But is it allowed [to make likenesses] of attendants of which it is impossible to make copies, seeing that it has been taught: 'Ye shall not make with me': [this implies], ye shall not make the likeness of My attendants who minister before Me on high?' — Abaye replied: The Torah forbade only the likeness of the four faces⁵ all together. If that is so, the portrait of a human being by himself should be allowed; why then has it been taught: All portraits are allowed, save the portrait of man? — R. Huna the son of R. Idi replied: From a discourse of Abaye I learnt: 'Ye shall not make with me' [implies], ye shall not make Me.⁶

Still, are the other attendants permitted, seeing that it has been taught: "'Ye shall not make with me": ye shall not make the likeness of My attendants who serve before Me on high, such as Ofanim and Seraphim and holy Hayyoth and ministering angels'? — Abaye replied: The Torah forbade only the attendants in the upper sphere.⁷ But are those in the lower sphere⁸ permitted? Has it not been taught: 'Which are in the heaven:⁹ this brings under the rule the sun, the moon, the stars and constellations; "above":¹⁰ this brings under the rule the ministering angels?' — That statement refers to the prohibition of [making a likeness] for serving them.

If for serving, then the tiniest worm should also [be prohibited]? — Yes, that is so, as it has been taught: Which are in the earth:¹¹ this brings under the rule mountains, hills, seas, rivers, streams and valleys. Beneath:¹² this brings under the rule the tiniest worm.

But is the mere making allowed? Has it not been taught: "'Ye shall not make with me": ye shall not make a likeness of My attendants who minister before Me, such as the sun, the moon, the stars and constellations'? — R. Gamaliel's case was different, because others¹³ made for him. But what of Rab Judah who [had a figure on a seal which] others had made for him, and yet Samuel said to him, Shinena,¹⁴ put out that fellow's eye?¹⁵ — In that case the seal was projecting, and [Samuel forbade it] so that it should not arouse suspicion,¹⁶ as it has been taught: 'A ring of which the seal projects must not be worn on the finger, but it is permitted to sign with it. If the seal is sunk in, it is permitted to wear it but forbidden to sign with it'. But does it matter if we do arouse suspicion? Was there not a synagogue which 'moved and settled' in Nehardea¹⁷ and in it was a statue [of a king] and Rab and Samuel and the father of Samuel used to go in there to pray, and were not afraid of arousing suspicion? — Where a whole body of persons is concerned it is different. But Rabban Gamaliel was an individual? — Since he was the Nasi,¹⁸ a large company was always with him. If you like I can say that it was [drawn] in sections,¹⁹ or if you like I can say that he did it for purposes of study, and it is written, Thou shalt not learn to do,²⁰ which implies that you may learn to understand and to teach.

MISHNAH. ON ONE OCCASION TWO WITNESSES CAME

AND SAID, WE SAW IT IN THE MORNING IN THE EAST

(1) Since a candlestick of other metal besides gold would have been permissible in the Temple. V. Men. 28.

(2) When they first recaptured the Temple from the Syrians, and were still too poor to provide a gold candlestick.

(3) I.e., the branches of the candlestick, so called because they had no ornaments. V. Tosaf. s.v.

(4) [MS.M.: with wood].

(5) V. Ezek. I, 10.

(6) [And since man was made in God's image (Gen. I, 27), the reproduction of the human face is not allowed.]

(7) In the seventh heaven.

(8) E.g., the second heaven, that of the sun and moon. V. Hag. 12.

(9) Ex. XX, 4 in the Ten Commandments.

(10) Ibid.

- (11) Ex. XX, 4.
- (12) Ibid.
- (13) Non-Jews.
- (14) You clever person. Lit. 'sharp-toothed'. V. B.B., Sonc. ed. p. 561, n. 14.
- (15) Deface the image. This shows that the fact that it had been made by others does not render it permissible.
- (16) That he used it for idolatrous purposes.
- (17) Rashi states that according to a legend this synagogue was originally built by King Jeconiah with stones brought from Jerusalem; v. Meg., Sonc. ed. p. 175, n. 5.
- (18) Lit., 'the Prince', the President of the Sanhedrin.
- (19) And so was not a complete likeness.
- (20) Deut. XVIII, 9.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 25a

AND IN THE EVENING IN THE WEST.¹ R. JOHANAN B. NURI THEREUPON SAID, THEY ARE FALSE WITNESSES.² WHEN, HOWEVER, THEY CAME TO JABNEH RABBAN GAMALIEL ACCEPTED THEM. ON ANOTHER OCCASION TWO WITNESSES CAME AND SAID, WE SAW IT AT ITS PROPER TIME,³ BUT ON THE NIGHT WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN NEW MOON⁴ IT WAS NOT SEEN, AND RABBAN GAMALIEL [HAD ALREADY] ACCEPTED THEIR EVIDENCE.⁵ RABBI DOSA B. HARKINAS SAID: THEY ARE FALSE WITNESSES. HOW CAN MEN TESTIFY THAT A WOMAN HAS BORN A CHILD WHEN ON THE NEXT DAY WE SEE HER BELLY STILL SWOLLEN?⁶ SAID R. JOSHUA TO HIM: I SEE [THE FORCE OF] YOUR ARGUMENT. THEREUPON RABBAN GAMALIEL SENT TO HIM TO SAY, I ENJOIN UPON YOU TO APPEAR BEFORE ME WITH YOUR STAFF AND YOUR MONEY ON THE DAY WHICH ACCORDING TO YOUR RECKONING SHOULD BE THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.⁷ R. AKIBA WENT [TO R. JOSHUA] AND FOUND HIM IN GREAT DISTRESS.⁸ HE SAID TO HIM: I CAN BRING PROOF [FROM THE SCRIPTURE] THAT WHATEVER RABBAN GAMALIEL HAS DONE IS VALID, BECAUSE IT SAYS, THESE ARE THE APPOINTED SEASONS OF THE LORD, HOLY CONVOCATIONS, WHICH YE SHALL PROCLAIM IN THEIR APPOINTED SEASONS,⁹ [WHICH MEANS TO SAY THAT] WHETHER THEY ARE PROCLAIMED AT THEIR PROPER TIME OR NOT AT THEIR PROPER TIME, I HAVE NO APPOINTED SEASONS SAVE THESE.¹⁰ HE [R. JOSHUA] THEN WENT TO R. DOSA B. HARKINAS, WHO SAID TO HIM: IF WE CALL IN QUESTION [THE DECISIONS OF] THE BETH DIN OF RABBAN GAMALIEL, WE MUST CALL IN QUESTION THE DECISIONS OF EVERY BETH DIN WHICH HAS EXISTED SINCE THE DAYS OF MOSES UP TO THE PRESENT TIME. FOR IT SAYS, THEN WENT UP MOSES AND AARON, NADAB AND ABIHU AND SEVENTY OF THE ELDERS OF ISRAEL.¹¹ WHY WERE NOT THE NAMES OF THE ELDERS MENTIONED? TO SHOW THAT EVERY GROUP OF THREE WHICH HAS ACTED AS A BETH DIN OVER ISRAEL IS ON A LEVEL WITH THE BETH DIN OF MOSES.¹² HE [R. JOSHUA] THEREUPON TOOK HIS STAFF AND HIS MONEY AND WENT TO JABNEH TO RABBAN GAMALIEL ON THE DAY ON WHICH THE DAY OF ATONEMENT FELL ACCORDING TO HIS RECKONING. RABBAN GAMALIEL ROSE AND KISSED HIM ON HIS HEAD AND SAID TO HIM: COME IN PEACE, MY TEACHER AND MY DISCIPLE — MY TEACHER IN WISDOM AND MY DISCIPLE BECAUSE YOU HAVE ACCEPTED MY DECISION.

GEMARA. It has been taught: Rabban Gamaliel said to the Sages: This formula has been handed down to me from the house of my father's father: Sometimes it [the moon] traverses [the heavens]¹³ by a long course and sometimes by a short course.¹⁴ R. Johanan said: What is the reason of the house of Rabbi?¹⁵ Because it is written, Who appointest the moon for seasons, the sun knoweth his going down.¹⁶ It is the sun which knows its going down, but the moon does not know its going down.¹⁷

R. Hiyya once saw the [old] moon in the heavens on the morning of the twenty-ninth day.¹⁸ He took a clod of earth and threw it at it, saying, Tonight we want to sanctify you,¹⁹ and are you still here! Go and hide yourself.²⁰ Rabbi thereupon said to R. Hiyya, Go to En Tob²¹ and sanctify the month,²² and send me the watchword, 'David king of Israel is alive and vigorous'.²³

Our Rabbis taught: Once the heavens were covered with clouds and the likeness of the moon was seen on the twenty-ninth of the month. The public were minded to declare New Moon, and the Beth din wanted to sanctify it, but Rabban Gamaliel said to them: I have it on the authority of the house of my father's father that the renewal of the moon takes place after not less than twenty-nine days and a half and two-thirds of an hour and seventy-three halakin.²⁴ On that day the mother of Ben Zaza died, and Rabban Gamaliel made a great funeral oration over her, not because she had merited it, but so that the public should know that the Beth din had not sanctified the month.²⁵

R. AKIBA WENT AND FOUND HIM²⁶ IN GREAT DISTRESS. The question was asked, Who was in distress? Was R. Akiba in distress or was R. Joshua in distress? — Come and hear, since it has been taught: 'R. Akiba went and found R. Joshua while he was in great distress. He said to him, Master, why are you in distress? He replied: Akiba, it were better for a man²⁷ to be on a sick-bed for twelve months than that such an injunction should be laid on him.²⁸ He said to him, [Master,] will you allow me to tell you something which you yourself have taught me? He said to him, Speak. He then said to him: The text says, 'you', 'you', 'you', three times,²⁹ to indicate that 'you' [may fix the festivals] even if you err inadvertently, 'you', even if you err deliberately, 'you', even if you are misled.³⁰ He replied to him in these words: 'Akiba, you have comforted me, you have comforted me'.³¹

HE THEN WENT TO R. DOSA B. HARKINAS etc. Our Rabbis taught: Why were not the names of these elders mentioned? So that a man should not say, Is So-and-so like Moses and Aaron? Is So-and-so like Nadab and Abihu? Is So-and-so like Eldad and Medad?³² Scripture also says, And Samuel said to the people, It is the Lord that made Moses and Aaron,³³ and it says [in the same passage], And the Lord sent Jerubaal and Bedan and Jephthah and Samuel.³⁴ Jerubaal is Gideon. Why is he called Jerubaal? Because he contended with Baal. Bedan is Samson. Why is he called Bedan? Because he came from Dan. Jephthah is Jephthah

(1) We should naturally suppose this to mean that they saw the old moon in the morning and the new moon in the evening.

(2) Presumably because according to what has been stated above (20b) the old moon is never visible for twenty-four hours before the new appears. But v. infra at the beginning of the Gemara and notes.

(3) Apparently this must have been on the thirtieth day shortly before nightfall.

(4) Lit., 'the night of its carry-over', i.e., after the nightfall with which the thirty-first day begins, when it should have been clearly visible.

(5) And declared the thirtieth day New Moon.

(6) Lit., 'between her teeth'. Similarly the old moon would still be 'between the teeth' of the new.

(7) The New Moon in question was that of Tishri, and consequently the Day of Atonement according to R. Joshua would fall a day later than according to R. Gamaliel.

(8) Because he had been ordered to profane the Day of Atonement.

(9) Lev. XXIII, 4.

(10) V. supra. 89.

(11) Ex. XXIV, 9.

(12) Seeing that most of the members of that Beth din also bore no names of distinction.

(13) Lit., 'it comes (to its setting place)'.
(14) This would seem to show that (in the first case mentioned in the Mishnah) the witnesses said that they saw the new moon on both occasions, and R. Johanan b. Nuri rejected them, on the ground that it could not go from, east to west so quickly, while R. Gamaliel held that it could. V. Rashi s.v. עדי שקר in the Mishnah.

- (15) Rabbi was a descendent of Rabban Gamaliel.
- (16) Ps. CIV, 19.
- (17) I.e., its speed varies.
- (18) Which was a sign that the new moon would not appear for at least twenty-four hours.
- (19) So that the Day of Atonement should not be on Sunday.
- (20) [Before nightfall, so that there should be no appearance of the old moon after the closing of the twenty-ninth day, which would prevent the thirtieth day from being proclaimed New Moon (Rashi); v. supra p. 85, n. 5].
- (21) A place in Judah where the Beth din [used to meet to sanctify the month. V. Tosaf. s.v. **בית**].
- (22) Disregarding what you have seen.
- (23) I.e., the moon is reborn. The expression is based on Ps. LXXXIX, 38.
- (24) Lit., 'parts' (sc. of one hour), 73/1080 X 60 m == 4 m 3 1/3 sec. The new moon, therefore, could not be seen on the twenty-ninth day.
- (25) As a funeral oration would not be delivered on New Moon, which was regarded as a holy day.
- (26) [MS.M. omits 'HIM' which explains the question which follows].
- (27) [Var. lec. 'me'. V. Maharsha.]
- (28) Var. lec. 'on me'. V. Maharsha.
- (29) I.e., the word **אתם** (them) in Lev. XXII, 31, XXIII, 2 and XXIII, 4 is read **את** (you) for homiletical purposes.
- (30) By the witnesses.
- (31) By showing me that Rabban Gamaliel was within his rights. V. Maharsha ad loc.
- (32) I.e., if a man does say so about the Beth din in his own time, we can answer him that they may be at least like the seventy elders who are unknown by name.
- (33) 1 Sam. XII, 6.
- (34) Ibid. 11. These are here put on a par with Moses and Aaron.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 25b

. It says also: Moses and Aaron among his priests and Samuel among them that call on his name.¹ [We see therefore that] the Scripture places three of the most questionable characters² on the same level as three of the the most estimable characters,³ to show that Jerubaal in his generation is like Moses in his generation, Bedan in his generation is like Aaron in his generation, Jephthah in his generation is like Samuel in his generation, [and] to teach you that the most worthless, once he has been appointed a leader⁴ of the community, is to be accounted like the mightiest of the mighty. Scripture says also: And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites and to the judge thou shall be in those days.⁵ Can we then imagine that a man should go to a judge who is not in his days? This shows that you must be content to go to the judge who is in your days. It also says; Say not, How was it that the former days were better than these.⁶

HE TOOK HIS STAFF AND HIS MONEY IN HIS HAND. Our Rabbis taught: When he [Rabban Gamaliel] saw him, he rose from his seat and kissed him on his head, saying, Peace to thee my teacher and my disciple — my teacher, because thou hast taught me Torah publicly, my disciple because I lay an injunction on thee and thou dost carry it out like a disciple. Happy is the generation in which the greater defer to the lesser, and all the more so the lesser to the greater! [You say] 'All the more so'! It is their duty!⁷ — What it means is that because the greater defer to the lesser, the lesser apply the lesson to themselves with all the more force.⁸

CHAPTER III

MISHNAH. IF THE BETH DIN AND ALL ISRAEL SAW IT,⁹ IF THE WITNESSES WERE TESTED¹⁰ AND THERE WAS NO TIME LEFT TO SAY 'SANCTIFIED' BEFORE IT GREW DARK, THEN THE MONTH IS PROLONGED.¹¹ IF THE BETH DIN¹² ALONE HAVE SEEN IT,¹³ TWO OF THEM SHOULD COME FORWARD AND TESTIFY BEFORE THEM, AND THEN THEY CAN SAY, 'SANCTIFIED, SANCTIFIED'. IF THREE PERSONS SAW IT, THEY

[THEMSELVES] CONSTITUTING THE BETH DIN, TWO [OF THEM] SHOULD COME FORWARD AND THEY SHOULD ASSOCIATE SOME OF THEIR COLLEAGUES WITH THE ONE LEFT, AND THEY [THE TWO] SHOULD TESTIFY BEFORE THEM AND THEY CAN THEN SAY, 'SANCTIFIED, SANCTIFIED'. [THIS MUST BE DONE] BECAUSE AN INDIVIDUAL IS NOT AUTHORIZED [TO SAY 'SANCTIFIED'] BY HIMSELF.

GEMARA. What need is there to state IF THE BETH DIN AND ALL ISRAEL SAW IT?¹⁴ — It is necessary. You might think that since the Beth din and all Israel have seen it everyone knows about it and therefore they should not prolong the month.¹⁵ Therefore we are told [that this is not so].

But when once it has been stated IF THE BETH DIN AND ALL ISRAEL SAW IT, why should it further say, IF THE WITNESSES HAVE BEEN TESTED?¹⁶ — What it means is, 'Or if the witnesses had been tested and there was no time left to say "sanctified" before it grew dark, then the month must be prolonged'.

But when once it has been stated if IT GREW DARK THEN THE MONTH IS PROLONGED, why should the testing of the witnesses be mentioned at all?¹⁷ — It is necessary. For you might suppose that the testing of the witnesses is regarded as the commencement of a suit in court, and the pronouncement of 'sanctified', 'sanctified' as the end of the suit, and therefore they should sanctify at night, on the analogy of money suits, as we have learnt, 'Money suits are heard by day and concluded [if necessary] at night'; so here we should sanctify at night. Therefore we are told [that this is not so]. But cannot I say that this actually is the case?¹⁸ — Scripture says, For it is a statute for Israel, a judgment for the God of Jacob.¹⁹ When does the word 'statute'²⁰ apply? To the conclusion of the suit; and the All-Merciful calls it 'judgment'. [Therefore we reason], Just as judgment is delivered by day,²¹ so here [the pronouncement must be] by day.

IF THE BETH DIN [ALONE] HAVE SEEN IT, TWO OF THEM SHOULD COME FORWARD AND TESTIFY BEFORE THEM. Why so? Surely hearing should not carry greater weight than seeing?²² — R. Zera said, [It is necessary if] for instance, they saw it at night.²³

IF THREE PERSONS SAW IT, THEY [THEMSELVES] CONSTITUTING THE BETH DIN, TWO [OF THEM] SHOULD COME FORWARD AND THEY SHOULD ASSOCIATE SOME OF THEIR COLLEAGUES WITH THE ONE LEFT. Why so? Here too we can argue that hearing should not carry greater weight than seeing? And should you reply that here too [it is necessary] if, for instance, they saw it at night, then this is the same case as the one [preceding]? — It was necessary to state the last clause²⁴

[VIZ.]: BECAUSE AN INDIVIDUAL IS NOT AUTHORIZED [TO SAY 'SANCTIFIED'] BY HIMSELF. For you might have thought that since it has been taught, 'Money suits must be tried before three, but one who is a recognized legal expert²⁵ can try them even alone', so here too one might sanctify the month single-handed. Therefore we are told [that this is not so]. But cannot I say that this actually is the case?²⁶ — There was no more universally recognized expert in Israel than Moses, and yet the Holy One, blessed be He, said to him, [Do not sanctify the month] until Aaron is with thee, as it is written, And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt saying, This month is to you.²⁷

This implies that a witness²⁸ may act as judge. Shall we say then that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Akiba, since it has been taught: 'If the Sanhedrin saw a man slay a person

(1) Ps. XCIX, 6. This shows that Samuel is on a par with Moses and Aaron.

(2) Lit., 'light ones of the world'.

(3) Lit., 'heavy ones of the world'.

- (4) Hebr. Parnas. V. Git, Sonc. ed, p. 280, n. 9.
- (5) Deut. XVII, 9.
- (6) I.e., had better judges than these. Eccl. VII, 10.
- (7) We naturally suppose the words to mean, 'all the more so where the lesser defer to the greater', which would imply that such a thing is not ordinarily to be expected.
- (8) I.e., they say, 'how much more should we defer to the greater'.
- (9) On the thirtieth day, shortly before nightfall.
- (10) The meaning of this is explained infra in the Gemara.
- (11) I.e., the thirty-first day becomes New Moon and not the thirtieth.
- (12) Of twenty-three members.
- (13) Not necessarily on the thirtieth day.
- (14) I.e., why mention Israel as well as the Beth din?
- (15) But reckon that same day as New Moon.
- (16) Why are witnesses needed if all the people have seen it?
- (17) Since this case can be inferred a fortiori from the previous one.
- (18) I.e., what reason is there why in general the pronouncement should not be made at night?
- (19) Ps. LXXXI, 5.
- (20) The Hebrew word is דין, which is taken by the Talmud in the sense of 'decision', 'verdict'.
- (21) V. Sanh. 32a.
- (22) I.e., the report of the witnesses should not carry greater weight than what they have seen with their own eyes.
- (23) Hence on the next day they must rely on a report.
- (24) I.e., this sentence merely leads up to the next.
- (25) Heb. Mumhe (v. Glos.).
- (26) That one expert may sanctify.
- (27) Ex. XII, 1, 2; cf. supra 22a.
- (28) I.e., one who is competent to act as witness, as here the Beth din.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 26a

, some of them act as witnesses and some as judges. This is the view of R. Tarfon. R. Akiba says: They all act as witnesses, and a witness cannot act as a judge'? — You may say that our Mishnah agrees even with R. Akiba. R. Akiba meant this rule to apply only to capital cases, in regard to which the All-Merciful enjoined, the congregation shall judge . . . and the congregation shall deliver¹ and since they have seen him slay a person, they cannot find any defence for him. But in this case even R. Akiba would agree [that a witness may act as judge].

MISHNAH. ALL KINDS OF SHOFAR² MAY BE USED EXCEPT [ONE MADE FROM THE HORN] OF A COW, BECAUSE IT IS [PROPERLY] KEREN.³ SAID R. JOSE: ARE NOT ALL SHOFARS CALLED 'KEREN' AS IT SAYS, WHEN THEY MAKE A LONG BLAST WITH THE RAM'S KEREN [HORN]?⁴

GEMARA. R. Jose was surely quite right. What can the Rabbis reply? — That all shofars are called both shofar and keren, whereas that of a cow is called keren but is not called shofar, as it is written, His firstling bullock, majesty is his, and his horns [karnaw] are as the horns of a re'em.⁵ What says R. Jose to this? — He can reply that that of a cow is also called shofar as it is written, And it shall please the Lord better than a bullock [shor par]⁶ that hath horns and hoofs.⁷ Now if 'shor' is mentioned here why 'par', and if 'par' why 'shor'?⁸ The fact is that shor par is equivalent to shofar.⁹ And the Rabbis? — They adopt the explanation of R. Mattenah; for R. Mattenah said: What is meant by shor par? A shor which is as full-grown as a par.¹⁰ 'Ulla said: The reason of the Rabbis is to be found in the saying of R. Hisda; for R. Hisda said: Why does not the High Priest enter the inner precincts¹¹ in garments of gold¹² to perform the service there? Because the accuser may not act as defender.¹³ Is that so? What of the blood of the bullock?¹⁴ — Seeing that this has been

transformed,¹⁵ the objection to it is removed.¹⁶ But what of the ark, with the mercy-seat and the cherub?¹⁷ — What we say is that the sinner should not bring near the offering. But what of the spoon and the censer?¹⁸ — What we say is that the sinner should not adorn himself. But what of the garments of gold [which he wore] in the outer sanctuary? — We speak of [ministrations In the] inner precincts. The shofar also is [used] in the outer precincts? — Since its purpose is to awaken remembrance, it is as if it were [used] within.

But the Tanna says BECAUSE IT IS [PROPERLY] KEREN? — He mentioned [only] an additional reason:¹⁹ one reason is because the accuser cannot act as defender, and the other is because it is keren. What says R. Jose to this? — His answer is: Your statement that the accuser cannot act as defender applies only to the inner precincts, and this shofar is [used] in the outer precincts. And as for your statement that this shofar is keren, all shofars are likewise called keren.

Abaye said: The reason of the Rabbis is that the All-Merciful prescribed ‘a shofar’, and not two or three shofars, and the one made from a cow's horn being in layers²⁰ looks like two or three shofars. But the Tanna says, BECAUSE IT IS PROPERLY KEREN? — He stated [only] an additional reason:¹⁹ one reason is that the All-Merciful prescribed one shofar, and not two or three shofars, and another reason is that it is keren. What then says R. Jose to this? — He can reply: With regard to your statement that the All-Merciful prescribed one shofar and not two or three shofar, since the layers are closely joined together, it is really one, and as for your statement that it is keren, all shofars are likewise called keren.

What proof is there that the word yobel here²¹ means ram? — As it has been taught: R. Akiba said: When I went to Arabia, they used to call a ram yobla. R. Akiba further said: When I went to Gallia, they used to call a niddah²² ‘galmudah’.²³ How galmudah? — [As much as to say], gemulah da [this one is isolated] from her husband. R. Akiba further said: When I went to Africa, they used to call a ma'ah²⁴ ‘kesitah’. What is the practical importance of this? — For explaining [the Scriptural expression] a hundred kesitah;²⁵ it means, a hundred danki.²⁶

Rabbi said: When I went to the sea-ports, they called mekirah [selling] ‘kirah’. What is the practical importance of this? — To explain [the Scriptural expression] asher karithi.²⁷ R. Simeon b. Lakish said: When I went to the district of Ken Nishraya,²⁸ they used to call a bride ninfe and a cock sekvi. ‘A bride ninfe’:²⁹ where do we find this in Scripture? Yefeh nof,³⁰ the joy of the whole earth.³¹ ‘A cock sekvi’: Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, or, if you prefer,³² of R. Joshua b. Levi: Where do we find this in the Scripture? Who hath put wisdom in the tuhoth,³³ or who hath given understanding to the sekvi?³⁴ ‘Who hath put wisdom in the tuhoth’ — these are the reins; ‘or who hath given understanding to the sekvi’ — this is the cock.

In a certain place which Levi happened to visit, a man came before him and said

(1) Num., XXXV, 25, 26. The word ‘deliver’ is taken by R. Akiba to mean ‘find a defence for’.

(2) A kind of trumpet made of the horn of certain animals. Scripture prescribes (Lev. XXV, 9) that a shofar should be used for proclaiming the Jubilee. The Psalmist also says (Ps. LXXXI, 4), Blow ye the shofar on the new moon.

(3) I.e., all kinds of horns may be used for making a shofar except that of a cow, because an instrument made from a cow's horn, though similar to a shofar in all respects, is properly called keren (lit. ‘horn’)

(4) Josh. VI, 5. This is identified by the Talmud with the shofar mentioned in the same verse (when ye hear the sound of the shofar).

(5) Deut. XXXIII, 17. We see here that the horn of a bullock is called keren.

(6) שׁוֹר פֶּרֶךְ, lit., ‘ox bullock’.

(7) Ps. LXIX, 32.

(8) Either of these expressions would be sufficient by itself.

(9) With ך inserted as is found in many Hebrew nouns, Strashun.]

- (10) The name shor could be applied to the animal at birth; the name par not till it entered its third year. V. supra, 10a,
- (11) The Holy of Holies, on the Day of Atonement.
- (12) The High Priest entered the Holy of Holies wearing garments of linen only. V. Lev. XVI, 4, 23.
- (13) 'Gold' is called the accuser in reference to the Golden Calf. The garments worn by the High Priest in the Holy of Holies and all his other appurtenances there were regarded as propitiatory.
- (14) Sprinkled by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement. A bullock could be regarded as an 'accuser' for the same reason as gold.
- (15) It is no longer recognizable as a bullock.
- (16) Lit., 'since it has been changed, it has been changed'.
- (17) In all of which there was an abundance of gold.
- (18) Which the High Priest took with him into the Holy of Holies and which were also of gold.
- (19) Lit., 'he says one and again'.
- (20) As a separate layer grows each year.
- (21) In Josh. VI, 5.
- (22) V. Glos.
- (23) Lit., 'desolate'.
- (24) A small coin.
- (25) Gen. XXXIII, 19: the price paid by Jacob for the field he bought at Shechem.
- (26) One sixth of a denar (v. Glos.).
- (27) Gen. L, 5. To be rendered, 'which I have bought for myself'. E.V. 'which I have digged for myself'.
- (28) [Kennesrin, south of Aleppo; Obermeyer p. 114].
- (29) ==GR.**.
- (30) E.V. 'beautiful in elevation'.
- (31) Ps. XLVIII, 3.
- (32) [Read with MS.M.: 'or as some say'.]
- (33) E.V. 'inward parts'.
- (34) E.V. 'mind'. Job. XXXVIII, 36.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 26b

, So-and-so has kaba'ed¹ me. He did not know what he meant, so he went and enquired in the Beth Hamidrash. They said to him: He wanted to say to you, 'has robbed me', as it is written, Will man rob [yikba'] God?² Raba from Barnish³ said to R. Ashi: Had I been there, I should have said to him, How did he kaba' you, in what did he kaba' you, why did he kaba' you, and so I should have found out [from his answers]. The other [Levi], however, thought that he meant some kind of offence.⁴

The Rabbis did not know what was meant by serugin⁵ till one day they heard the maidservant of Rabbi's household, on seeing the Rabbis enter at intervals, say to them, How long are you going to come in by serugin?

The Rabbis did not know what was meant by haluglugoth⁶ till one day they heard the handmaid of the household of Rabbi, on seeing a man peeling portulaks, say to him, How long will you be peeling your haluglugoth?

The Rabbis did not know what was meant by 'salselehah' and it shall exalt thee.⁷ One day they heard the handmaid of the household of Rabbi say to a man who was curling his hair, How long will you be mesalseh⁸ with your hair?

The Rabbis did not know what was meant by we-tetethia bematate of destruction,⁹ till one day they heard the handmaid of the household of Rabbi say to her companion, Take the tatitha [broom] and tati [sweep] the house.

The Rabbis did not know what was meant by Cast upon the Lord thy yehab and he shall sustain thee.¹⁰ Said Rabbah b. Bar Hanah: One day I was travelling with an Arab¹¹ and was carrying a load, and he said to me, Lift up your yehab and put it on [one of] the camels.¹²

MISHNAH. THE SHOFAR USED ON NEW YEAR¹³ WAS OF AN ANTELOPE'S HORN AND STRAIGHT, AND ITS MOUTH WAS OVERLAID WITH GOLD. THERE WERE TWO TRUMPETS, ONE ON EACH SIDE OF IT. THE SHOFAR GAVE A LONG BLAST AND THE TRUMPETS A SHORT ONE, SINCE THE PROPER CEREMONY OF THE DAY WAS WITH THE SHOFAR.¹⁴ ON [COMMUNAL] FAST DAYS THEY USED [TWO] CURVED SHOFARS OF RAMS, THE MOUTHS OF WHICH WERE OVERLAID WITH SILVER. THERE WERE TWO TRUMPETS BETWEEN THEM; A SHORT BLAST WAS MADE WITH THE SHOFARS AND A LONG ONE WITH THE TRUMPETS, BECAUSE THE RELIGIOUS DUTY OF THE DAY WAS [TO BE PERFORMED] WITH THE TRUMPETS.¹⁵ THE JUBILEE IS ON A PAR WITH NEW YEAR FOR BLOWING THE HORN AND FOR BLESSINGS.¹⁶ R. JUDAH SAYS: ON NEW YEAR THE BLAST IS MADE WITH A SHOFAR OF RAMS AND ON JUBILEES WITH ONE OF ANTELOPES.

GEMARA. R. Levi said: The religious duty of New Year and of the Day of Atonement is performed with a curved shofar, and on other days in the year with a straight shofar. But we learn, THE SHOFAR OF NEW YEAR WAS A STRAIGHT ONE OF ANTELOPE'S HORN? — Levi followed the view of the following Tanna, as it has been taught: 'R. Judah says, On New Year they used to blow with curved shofars of rams' horns and on jubilees with shofars of antelopes' horns'. Why then did not he [Levi] say that the law¹⁷ follows the view of R. Judah?¹⁸ — If you were to say that the law follows R. Judah, I should say that in the case of the Jubilee also he was of the same opinion as R. Judah. Now we know [that this is not so]. What is the ground of the difference [between R. Judah and the First Tanna]? — One authority [R. Judah] holds that on New Year the more a man [so to speak] bends his mind the more effective [is his prayer], while on the Day of Atonement [of the Jubilee] the more a man elevates¹⁹ his mind the better is the effect.²⁰ The other authority holds that on New Year the more a man elevates his mind the better the effect, and on fast days the more he bends his mind the better the effect.

(1) קבע

(2) Mal. III, 8.

(3) [Near Sura, v. Obermeyer, p. 297.]

(4) [Lit., 'a matter of prohibition', the nature of which could not be ascertained from the answers, v. Maharsha.]

(5) Found e.g., in Meg. 17a, 'if he reads it by serugin', i.e. 'not in order.'

(6) Found in Yoma 18a.

(7) Prov. IV, 8. E.V. 'extol her'.

(8) I.e., adorning.

(9) Isa. XIV, 23. E.V. 'I will sweep it with the besom of destruction'.

(10) Ps. LV, 23. E.V. 'burden'.

(11) [Heb. Ta'ya, name of an Arab tribe which name came finally to be applied to Arabs in general, as the name of a part is often given to a whole.]

(12) On this passage v. Meg. 18a.

(13) In the Temple.

(14) Hence the sound of the shofar was allowed to be heard after that of the trumpets.

(15) As it says, (Num. X, 2), Make thee two trumpets of silver . . . for the calling of the congregation, and on fast days the public were summoned to assemble.

(16) I.e., nine blessings have to be said over the shofar as on New Year.

(17) [Read with MS.M.: 'the halachah is'.]

(18) As expressed in the Mishnah,

(19) Lit., 'straightens', with the idea of freedom.

(20) On the analogy of the words, Let us lift up our hearts to our hands unto God in the heavens (Lam. III, 41).

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 27a

AND ITS MOUTH WAS OVERLAID WITH GOLD. But has it not been taught: 'If it was overlaid with gold at the place where the mouth is applied, it is not valid;¹ if not at the place where the mouth is applied, it is valid'? — Abaye replied: When this state ment is made in our Mishnah, it also refers to the place where the mouth is not applied.

THERE WERE TWO TRUMPETS, ONE ON EACH SIDE OF IT. But can two distinct sounds be caught at once?² Has it not been taught:³ "Remember" and "observe" were spoken in a single utterance,⁴ a thing which transcends the capacity of the [human] mouth to utter and of the [human] ear to hear'? — It was for this reason that the blast of the shofar was prolonged. This implies that if one heard the end of the blast without the beginning he has performed his duty;⁵ and from this it would follow that if he heard the beginning of the blast without the end he has equally performed his duty. Come now and hear [a refutation of this idea]: 'If he blew teki'ah at the beginning [of the service] and prolonged the second so as to make it equal to two, this only counts as one'.⁶ Why should this be? Why should not it [the second blast] be counted as divided into two?⁷ — We do not divide a teki'ah into two.

Come and hear [another objection]: If one blew into a pit or a cistern or a barrel, if the sound of the shofar came out [pure], he has performed his duty, but if an echo came out [with it], he has not performed his duty.⁸ Why should this be? Cannot he have performed his duty [by hearing] the beginning of the blast, before the sound is confused [with the echo]? — The truth is that two utterances proceeding from one man cannot be distinguished, but proceeding from two men they can be distinguished.⁹ But if they proceed from two men can they be distinguished? Have we not learnt: 'In the recital of the Torah [in synagogue] one may read and another translate;¹⁰ what is not allowed is that¹¹ one should read¹² and two translate'.¹³ — The fact is that our case resembles that mentioned in the next clause [of this quotation]: 'In the recital of Hallel and the Megillah¹⁴ even ten may read'.¹⁵ This shows that since an interest is taken in these,¹⁶ the hearer pays close attention. So here, since an interest is taken, he pays close attention and hears [the two sounds]. Why then is the blast of the shofar prolonged? — So that people should know that the proper ceremony of the day is with the shofar.

ON FAST DAYS THEY USED CURVED SHOFARS OF RAMS' HORNS THE MOUTHS OF WHICH WERE OVERLAID WITH SILVER. Why in the other case should gold have been used and here silver? — If you like I can reply that for all public gatherings silver is used, as it is written, Make thee two trumpets of silver,¹⁷ or if you like I can say that the Torah wished to spare Israel unnecessary expense.¹⁸ [If that is so], we should use silver in the other case also? — Even so, this consideration is outweighed by that of paying respect to the holyday.

R. Papa b. Samuel was minded to follow the instructions of the Mishnah,¹⁹ but Raba said to him, These instructions were laid down only for the Sanctuary. It has been taught to the same effect: Where do these rules apply? To the Sanctuary; but in the provinces, where the trumpets are in place²⁰ there is no shofar, and where the shofar is in place²¹ there are no trumpets. R. Halafta adopted the same custom in Zepphoris and R. Hananiah b. Teradion in Sikni,²² and when this was reported to the Sages they said: This was not the practice save only in the gates of the East and the Mount of the Temple.²³ Said Raba — or it may be R. Joshua b. Levi: What is the Scriptural warrant for this? — Because it is written, With trumpets and the sound of the shofar shout ye before the king, the Lord:²⁴ before the king, the Lord,²⁵ we require trumpets and the sound of the shofar, but elsewhere not.

THE JUBILEE IS ON A PAR WITH THE NEW YEAR FOR BLOWING THE HORN AND FOR BLESSINGS. R. Samuel b. Isaac asked: What authority do we follow in saying nowadays [on New Year] the prayer, 'This day is the beginning of thy works, the commemoration of the first day'?²⁶ What authority? R. Eliezer, who said that the world was created in Tishri. R. 'Ena raised an objection [against this view]: [It is stated], THE JUBILEE IS ON A PAR WITH THE NEW YEAR FOR BLOWING THE TRUMPET AND FOR BLESSINGS. [Now how can this be on your view] seeing that there is [the prayer], 'This day is the beginning of thy works, the commemoration of the first day'?²⁷ — The statement of the Mishnah refers to the other [features]. R. Shisha the son of R. Idi reported the discussion thus. 'R. Samuel b. Isaac said: This statement of our Mishnah, THE JUBILEE IS ON A PAR WITH THE NEW YEAR FOR BLOWING THE HORN AND FOR BLESSINGS. — which authority does it follow? Not that of R. Eliezer. For if you were to say it follows R. Eliezer, seeing that he holds that the world was created in Tishri, what would you make of "This day is the commencement of thy works, the commemoration of the first day", which is said on New Year and is not said on the Jubilee? — [The answer is that] the Mishnah speaks only of the other [features]'.

MISHNAH. A SHOFAR WHICH HAS BEEN SPLIT AND STUCK TOGETHER IS NOT VALID.²⁸ IF FRAGMENTS OF SHOFARS

ARE STUCK TOGETHER [TO MAKE ONE], IT IS NOT VALID.

-
- (1) Because the blast has to be made with a shofar, and not with gold.
 - (2) As much as to say, if the shofar and the trumpets are blown together, the sound of the shofar will not be distinguished.
 - (3) B.B. 64a.
 - (4) In the version of the Ten Commandments in Ex. XX, the fourth commandment commences with the words Remember the Sabbath day, whereas in Deut. V it commences with 'Observe'; and the Rabbis explain the discrepancy in this way.
 - (5) Seeing that in this case he hears distinctly only the end of the shofar blast, after the trumpets have ceased.
 - (6) This is a quotation from the Mishnah on 33b, where an explanation will be found in the notes.
 - (7) So that the beginning would count as the end of the first series of teki'ah teru'ah teki'ah, and the end of it would count as the beginning of the second series.
 - (8) V. infra 28a.
 - (9) And so the shofar and the trumpets can be distinguished here.
 - (10) It was usual in ancient times to read after each verse of the Torah the authorized Aramaic translation (targum) of it.
 - (11) Lit., 'only one should not'.
 - (12) So in Meg. loc. cit. Our texts have here 'two should read and two translate'.
 - (13) Meg. 21b.
 - (14) The book of Esther.
 - (15) V. loc. cit. for notes.
 - (16) Lit., 'endeared'. I.e., a greater interest than in the Torah, since they come more rarely.
 - (17) Num. X, 2. V. supra.
 - (18) Lit., 'had mercy on the money of Israel'.
 - (19) I.e., to use both shofar and trumpets.
 - (20) I.e., on fast days.
 - (21) I.e., on New Year and Jubilees.
 - (22) perhaps Sogana in Galilee mentioned in Josephus, Vita, 51.
 - (23) I.e., the gates of the East on the Temple Mount. According to some, however, the 'gates of the East' were in the Women's Court (v. Rashi).
 - (24) Ps. XCVIII, 6.
 - (25) I.e., in the Temple.
 - (26) In the Musaf 'Amidah for New Year, v. P.B., p. 250.

(27) Which cannot be said on the Day of Atonement of the Jubilee.

(28) Because it is like two shofars.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 27b

IF A HOLE IN A SHOFAR HAS BEEN STOPPED UP, IF IT INTERFERES WITH THE BLOWING IT IS NOT VALID, BUT OTHERWISE IT IS VALID.¹ IF ONE BLOWS INTO A PIT OR A CISTERN² OR A BARREL, IF HE CAN HEAR THE SOUND OF THE SHOFAR [PURE] HE HAS PERFORMED HIS DUTY, BUT IF HE HEARS THE ECHO [ALSO], HE HAS NOT PERFORMED HIS DUTY. SIMILARLY IF ONE WAS PASSING BEHIND A SYNAGOGUE OR IF HIS HOUSE WAS ADJOINING THE SYNAGOGUE AND HE HEARD THE SOUND OF THE SHOFAR OR OF THE MEGILLAH³ [BEING READ], IF HE LISTENS WITH ATTENTION⁴ HE PERFORMS THE RELIGIOUS PRECEPT [BY SO HEARING], BUT OTHERWISE HE DOES NOT; ALTHOUGH ONE HEARS EQUALLY WITH THE OTHER, [YET THERE IS A DIFFERENCE, BECAUSE] THE ONE LISTENED WITH ATTENTION WHILE THE OTHER DID NOT LISTEN WITH ATTENTION.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: 'If the horn was too long and it has been shortened, it is valid. If it has been scraped till it becomes thin like a wafer,⁵ it is valid. If it is overlaid at the spot where the mouth is applied, it is not valid, if not at the spot where the mouth is applied,⁶ it is valid. If it is overlaid with gold on the inside, it is not valid,⁷ if on the outside, if the sound is thereby changed from what it was before, it is not valid, but otherwise it is valid. If it had a hole which has been stopped up, if this interferes with the blast it is not valid, but otherwise it is valid.⁸ If one shofar is put inside another shofar, if one can hear the sound of the inner one he thereby performs his religious duty, but if he hears the sound of the outer one he does not thereby perform his religious duty.⁹

Our Rabbis taught: If it was scraped whether on the inside or the outside, it is valid. If it was scraped till it became [thin like] a wafer, it is valid. If one shofar is placed within another, if one hears the sound of the inner one he thereby performs his religious duty, but if he hears the sound of the outer one he does not thereby perform his religious duty. If he turns it inside out¹⁰ and blows it, he does not thereby perform his religious duty. Said R. Papa: Do not take this to mean [merely], 'if he turned it inside out like a coat', but even if he widened the narrow part and narrowed the wide part. What is the reason? — As stated by R. Mattenah; for R. Mattenah said: And thou shalt carry along:¹¹ we require [the horn to be] of the shape in which it is carried along.¹²

Our Rabbis taught: 'If the least quantity is added to it whether of its own material or of another material, it is not valid. If there was a hole in it and it is stopped up, whether with its own material or another material, it is not valid. R. Nathan, however, says, if with its own material it is valid, but if with another material it is not valid'.¹³ 'If with its own material it is valid': Said R. Johanan: This is the case only if the greater part of the original is left. From this we infer that if it is stopped with another material, even though the greater part of the original was left it may not be used. Some attach R. Johanan's remark to the latter clause: 'If with another material it is not valid': Said R. Johanan: This is the case only if the greater part of the original was removed. From this we infer that if the stoppage is made with the same material, even though the greater part of the original is gone it is valid.¹⁴ 'If it was overlaid with gold on the inside it is not valid, if on the outside, if its sound becomes different from what it was before, it is not valid, but otherwise it is valid. If it is split lengthwise it is not valid, but if breadthwise, if enough is left to produce a blast it is valid, but otherwise it is not valid.'¹⁵ How much is enough to produce a blast? — R. Simeon b. Gamaliel explained: Enough to allow of it being held in the hand and leaving something showing on either side. 'If its sound is thin or thick or dry, it is valid, since all sounds emitted by a shofar can pass muster',¹⁶

They sent to inform the father of Samuel: If one pierced it [the horn] and blew with it, he has performed his religious duty. Is not this obvious? All shofars are pierced!¹⁷ — R. Ashi explained: [It means], if he pierced the inset bone.¹⁸ You might think that although it is of the same material it makes a partition; we are therefore told [that this is not so].

IF ONE BLOWS INTO A PIT OR A CISTERN etc. R. Huna said: This rule applies only to those standing on the edge of the pit, but those standing in the pit perform their religious duty thereby. It has been taught to the same effect: 'If one blows into a pit or a cistern, he performs his religious duty'. But have we not learnt, HE DOES NOT PERFORM HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY? You must therefore understand it in the sense of R. Huna's dictum. Some put the two statements in opposition, [thus]: We have learnt, IF ONE BLOWS INTO A PIT OR A CISTERN HE DOES NOT PERFORM HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY. But has it not been taught, 'He does perform his religious duty'? — R. Huna replied: There is no contradiction; the one statement speaks of those standing on the edge of the pit, the other of those standing in the pit.

Rabbah¹⁹ said:

(1) The Talmud Yerushalmi reads here, 'If it (the hole) interfered with the blowing before it was closed, the shofar is not valid after it was closed'. Our version, however, rather implies that if the stoppage restores the shofar to its original condition, it may be used. V. Tosaf. s.v. נִיקָב.

(2) Heb. דֹּת , a pit faced with cement.

(3) V. Glos.

(4) Lit., 'if he applies his heart'.

(5) Lit., 'he reduced it to its coating'.

(6) This apparently means, on the top opposite the exact spot to which the mouth is applied. V. Tosaf. s.v. צִפְהוּ.

(7) Because the blast is then made by gold.

(8) V. supra n. 1.

(9) Because as the sound comes from the air between the two shofars, it is as if made by two or three shofars. V. Tosaf. s.v. אֵם .

(10) By means of softening it with hot water.

(11) וְהֵעֵבֶרְתָּ Lev. XXV, 9. E.V. Then shalt thou make proclamation with. Lit., 'cause to pass'.

(12) By the ram when alive.

(13) The quotation is here interrupted with a gloss on the last clause.

(14) The quotation from the Baraitha is here resumed.

(15) The quotation is again interrupted.

(16) Lit., 'are valid'.

(17) I.e., the horn is pierced to make a shofar.

(18) A bone which grows from the animal's head inside the horn, and which is usually removed to make the shofar.

(19) Var. lec. Raba.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 28a

If one heard part of the blast in the pit and part of the blast on the edge of the pit,¹ he has performed his religious duty. If he heard part of the blast before the dawn² and part of the blast after dawn he has not performed his religious duty. Said Abaye to him: Why this difference? Because in the latter case we require the whole of the blast [which he hears] to be obligatory and this requirement is not fulfilled?³ In the former case also we require the whole of the blast to be obligatory, and this requirement is not fulfilled!⁴ — Are the two cases parallel? In the latter, night is a time to which the obligation does not apply at all, but in the former, the pit is a place to which the obligation does apply for those who are in the pit.⁵

I infer from this that Rabbah was of opinion that if one heard the end of a blast without the

beginning he has performed his religious duty,⁶ and that from this it follows that if he heard the beginning without the end, he has likewise performed his religious duty. Come now and hear [an objection to this]: ‘If one blew a teki’ah at the beginning [of the series] and prolonged the second one so as to be equal to two, it still counts as only one’. Why should this be? Let it be counted as divided into two? — We do not divide teki’ahs.⁷ Come and hear [another objection]: ‘If one blows into a pit or a cistern or a barrel, if he hears the sound of the shofar [pure] he has performed his religious duty, but if he hears the echo he has not performed his religious duty’. Why should this be? Let him have performed his religious duty with the beginning of the blast, before the sound is confused [with the echo?] — Rabbah was speaking of one who blows [for himself] and as he blows steps out of the pit.⁸ If that is so, what is the point of his remark?⁹ — You might argue that sometimes he puts his head out while the shofar is still in the pit and so the sound is confused. We are therefore told [that this makes no difference].

Rab Judah said: One should not blow with a shofar taken from a burnt-offering,¹⁰ but if he did so¹¹ he has performed his religious duty. One should not blow with a shofar taken from a peace-offering, and if he did so he has not performed his religious duty. What is the reason? A burnt-offering is subject to the rule of trespass,¹² and once trespass has been committed with it, it becomes unhallowed. Peace-offerings, on the other hand, not being subject to the rule of trespass,¹³ are still saddled with their prohibition,¹⁴ (and do not become unhallowed).¹⁵ Raba strongly demurred to this. When [he said], is the trespass committed? After he has blown; but when he blows, he does so with something prohibited.¹⁶ No, said Raba: alike in one case and the other, he has not performed his religious duty. Later, however, he said: Alike in one case and in the other he has performed his religious duty, because religious precepts are not meant to provide physical enjoyment.¹⁷

Rab Judah said: One should not blow with a shofar which has been used for idolatrous purposes,¹⁸ but if he does so, he has performed his religious duty.¹⁹ One should not blow with a shofar from a devoted city,²⁰ and if he does so he has not performed his religious duty. What is the reason? In a devoted city nothing is [presumably] left of proper size.²¹

Raba said: If one is interdicted by vow to have any benefit²² from his neighbour, the other may yet perform the ritual blowing of the shofar for him.²³ One, too, who is interdicted by vow to have any enjoyment from a shofar may yet perform with it the ritual blowing. Raba further said: If one is interdicted by vow to have any benefit from his neighbour, the other may yet sprinkle on him the water of the sin-offering²⁴ in the rainy season, but not in the summer time. One who has vowed to have no enjoyment from a fountain may take a ritual bath in it in the rainy season²⁵ but not in the summer time.

They sent to inform the father of Samuel: If a man is compelled by force to eat unleavened bread [on Passover], he thereby performs his religious duty.²⁶ Compelled by whom? Shall I say, by an evil spirit? But has it not been taught, ‘If a man is sometimes in his sound senses and sometimes crazy, when he is in his senses he is regarded as a sane man in all particulars, and when he is crazy he is regarded as insane in all particulars’?²⁷ — R. Ashi said: [It means], if the Persians compelled him. Said Raba:²⁸ This would imply that if one blew the shofar simply to make music, he has performed his religious duty. Is not this obvious?²⁹ This is just what has been said!³⁰ — You might argue that in the previous case the All-Merciful has prescribed that unleavened bread should be eaten, and he has eaten³¹

(1) We naturally suppose this to speak of one who steps out of the pit while he hears someone else blowing in the pit.

(2) [Lit., ‘before the pillar of the dawn went up’. This is the legal dividing line between night and day.]

(3) It is obligatory to hear the shofar only by day but not by night.

(4) One who is on the edge of the pit does not fulfil his obligation by hearing one blow in the pit.

(5) And he fulfils his obligation with the part he heard in the pit.

- (6) V. supra.
- (7) V. supra, and notes.
- (8) And he hears both the beginning and the end of the blast clearly.
- (9) As it is obvious.
- (10) Made from the horn of a living animal which, has been consecrated for a burnt-offering. After it has been offered and the blood thereof sprinkled the law of trespass does not apply to its horns, v. infra.
- (11) Unwittingly. V. Tosaf. s.v. **בשופר** .
- (12) Heb. **מעילה** , the using of holy things for secular purposes, v. Lev. V, 15ff.
- (13) I.e., even while still alive. After it had been offered and the blood sprinkled the law of trespass applied to certain portions of the flesh assigned for the altar.
- (14) Even if they have been accidentally used for secular purposes, they remain hallowed and must not be further used for such purposes.
- (15) These words in the text are bracketed.
- (16) Even in the case of the burnt-offering.
- (17) And since he derives no physical enjoyment from the act, he does not commit trespass.
- (18) Because no benefit may be derived from articles which have been used for idolatrous purposes, v. A.Z. 51b.
- (19) Because such performance is not intended to give any enjoyment. This reason is based on the opinion of Raba and not of Rab Judah; perhaps therefore we should read here 'Raba said', not 'Rab Judah said'. V. Tosaf. s.v. **אמר רב יהודה** .
- (20) V. Deut. XIII, 13-17.
- (21) Lit., 'its measurements are cut to pieces'. Everything in it was supposed to be burnt.
- (22) Heb. **הנאה** which can mean either 'benefit' or enjoyment'.
- (23) For this is no physical enjoyment.
- (24) Of the red heifer, to cleanse him from the pollution of a dead body.
- (25) I.e., when it is cold.
- (26) Even though he had no intention of performing it.
- (27) And we cannot speak of the performance of religious duties in connection with an insane person.
- (28) Var. lec. Rabbah.
- (29) Viz., that this is the implication of R. Ashi's remark.
- (30) Lit., 'this is that'.
- (31) And has obtained some physical benefit.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 28b

, whereas in this case it is written a memorial of blowing the trumpet¹ and this man is merely amusing himself.² Therefore we are told [that this argument does not apply].

We conclude from this that in Raba's opinion religious precepts do not need to be performed with deliberate intention. The following objection was raised against this view: 'If a man was reading the [passage of the shema] in the Torah and the time of reading [the shema] arrived, if he put his mind to it, he has performed his religious duty'. Does this not mean, 'put his mind to perform his religious duty'? — No; it means, [put his mind] to read [distinctly]. To read? But he is reading! — We speak of one who is reading to correct [the scroll].³

Come and hear: 'IF HE WAS PASSING BEHIND THE SYNAGOGUE, OR IF HIS HOUSE WAS ADJOINING THE SYNAGOGUE, AND HE HEARD THE SOUND OF THE SHOFAR OR OF THE READING OF THE MEGILLAH, IF HE PUT HIS MIND TO IT HE THEREBY PERFORMED HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY, BUT IF NOT HE DID NOT PERFORM HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY'. Does not this mean, 'if he put his mind to perform his religious duty'? — No; [it means, if he put his mind] to hear. To hear? But he is hearing! — He may think, it is merely an ass braying. The following objection was raised against this view: 'If the hearer [of the shofar] put his mind to the act but not the performer,⁴ or the performer put his mind but not the hearer, he did not perform

his religious duty; [he does not do so] until both hearer and performer put their minds to the act'. I understand the case where the performer put his mind but not the hearer, as the latter may have thought it was merely an ass braying. But that the hearer should put his mind and not the performer — how can this happen? Is it not where the latter blows merely to make music?⁵ — Perhaps [it refers to a case] where he merely [as it were] barks.⁶ Said Abaye to him:⁷ But if that is so, then one who sleeps in the Sukkah⁸ on the eighth day should be flogged?⁹ — He replied: [Not so], because I maintain that commandments cannot be transgressed [by adding to them] save in their proper season.

R. Shaman b. Abba raised the following objection against this view: 'Whence do we learn that a priest who mounts the platform¹⁰ should not say, "Because the Torah has given me permission to bless Israel, I will add a blessing of my own, as for instance, The Lord, the God of your fathers, add unto you"?¹¹ Because it says, Ye shall not add unto the word'.¹² Now here, since he has finished blessing them,¹³ the time of the precept has passed, and yet it states that he transgresses? — Here we are dealing with the case where he has not yet finished the blessings. But the statement runs, 'he has finished'? — That means, he has finished one blessing.¹⁴ But it states, 'he finished all his blessings'? — There is a special reason in this case; seeing that, if he comes across another congregation, he may bless again, the whole day is reckoned as the proper time.¹⁵ But what is your ground for saying so? — Because we have learnt: If blood which has to be sprinkled [on the altar] once¹⁶ has been mixed with other blood which had to be sprinkled once, the whole should be sprinkled once. If blood which has to be sprinkled four times¹⁷ has been mixed with other blood which has to be sprinkled four times, the whole must be sprinkled four times. If blood which has to be sprinkled four times is mixed with blood which has to be sprinkled once, R. Eleazar says the whole should be sprinkled four times. R. Joshua says it should be sprinkled once. Said R. Eleazar to him: By doing so he transgresses the precept of 'thou shalt not diminish'.¹⁸ To which R. Joshua retorted, By doing your way, he transgresses the precept of thou shalt not add.¹⁹ Said R. Eleazar to him: The precept 'thou shalt not add' applies only when the act is repeated on the same subject.²⁰ To which R. Joshua replied: The precept 'thou shalt not diminish' applies only where the act is withheld from the same subject.²⁰ R. Joshua said further to him: If you do not sprinkle [four times], you transgress the rule of 'thou shalt not diminish', but you do not perform any positive action,²¹ When you do sprinkle, you transgress the rule of 'thou shalt not add' and you do perform a positive action.²² Now here, as soon as he has made one sprinkling for the firstborn, its time is past, and yet it says that he transgresses the precept of 'thou shalt not add'; and is not the reason for this because we say that since, if he gets hold of another firstborn he can sprinkle its blood, the whole day is reckoned its proper time? — [No.] Perhaps R. Joshua was of opinion that precepts may be transgressed even out of their proper time.²³ We argue thus.²⁴ Why does R. Shaman b. Abba leave the Mishnah and bring his objection from the Baraitha? Let him bring his objection from the Mishnah! What is the reason why he does not adduce the Mishnah? On the ground that, if he [the priest] gets hold of another firstborn he can sprinkle its blood, the whole day is its proper time. But in the case mentioned in the Baraitha also, seeing that, if he comes across another congregation he may bless again, the whole day is the proper time! What says R. Shaman b. Abba to this? — In that case [of the blood], he is bound to sprinkle;²⁵ in this case, if he likes he may bless, and if he likes he need not bless.

Raba says: For the performance of his religious duty, he does not require to put his mind to it. For transgression [by adding to the precept], he does require to put his mind. But what of the sprinkling of blood, where, according to R. Joshua, he transgresses though he does not put his mind to it?²⁶ Raba therefore [corrected himself and] said: For the performance of the religious duty he does not require to put his mind to it; for [being accounted to have committed a] transgression [by adding to the precept] if [the act is done] in proper time, he does not require to put his mind to it; if it is not done in its proper time he does require to put his mind to it.

R. Zera said to his attendant:

- (1) Lev. XXIII, 24.
- (2) Lit., 'occupying himself'. And we are told infra that one who blows merely to pass the time does not fulfil his obligation.
- (3) And only mumbles the words.
- (4) Lit., 'he who causes to hear'.
- (5) And in such a case he does not perform the precept of blowing the shofar, which would show that such performance requires intention.
- (6) I.e., produces only half the requisite sound.
- (7) Raba.
- (8) V. Glos.
- (9) Because the commandment is to sleep there only seven days, and he is adding to the commandment even if he does not mean to, v. Deut. IV, 2.
- (10) Heb. דּוֹכֵן .
- (11) Deut. I, 11.
- (12) Ibid. IV, 2.
- (13) Before he adds his own blessing.
- (14) Of the three priestly blessings.
- (15) And we may still hold that commandments cannot be transgressed by adding to them save in their proper time.
- (16) E.g., the blood of the firstborn of cattle when brought as a sacrifice. Lit., 'has to be given in a single gift'.
- (17) E.g., the blood of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings which had to be sprinkled on four corners of the altar.
- (18) Because he sprinkles in one instalment blood which should be sprinkled in four.
- (19) Because he sprinkles in four instalments blood which should be sprinkled in one.
- (20) Lit., 'when it (the instrument of the religious act) is by itself'.
- (21) I.e., the sin is one of omission only.
- (22) I.e., the sin is one of commission, v. Zeb. 80a.
- (23) So that this Mishnah affords no support for the distinction made above in regard to the blessing of the priest and thus the objection against Raba stands.
- (24) In trying to bring support from the Mishnah to the above distinction.
- (25) Lit., 'there is no way of not giving'; if he gets other blood.
- (26) He does not intend to sprinkle the blood of the firstborn in the last three installments.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 29a

Put your mind to it and blow [the shofar] for me. I gather from this that in his opinion the performer requires to put his mind to it.¹ The following was raised in objection against this view: IF HE WAS PASSING BEHIND THE SYNAGOGUE, OR IF HIS HOUSE WAS ADJOINING THE SYNAGOGUE AND HE HEARD THE SOUND OF THE SHOFAR OR THE READING OF THE MEGILLAH, IF HE PUT HIS MIND TO IT HE THEREBY PERFORMED HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY, BUT IF NOT HE DID NOT. And if he did put his mind to it, what difference does it make [on your theory], seeing that the other [the performer] was not consciously performing for him? — We are here speaking of a congregational reader who performs consciously for all.

Come and hear: 'If the hearer put his mind to it but not the performer, or if the performer put his mind to it but not the hearer, he did not perform his religious duty; [he does not do so] until both the hearer and the performer put their mind to it'. Here he mentions the performer in the same breath with the hearer, [to indicate that] just as the hearer hears for himself, so the performer performs for himself, and [in such a case] he states that 'he did not perform his religious duty'² — There is a difference on this point between Tannaim, as it has been taught: The hearer hears for himself, and the performer performs for all and sundry.³ R. Jose said: This applies only to a congregational reader, but an ordinary individual does not perform his religious duty until both the hearer and the performer put their mind to it.

MISHNAH. [IT IS WRITTEN] AND IT CAME TO PASS, WHEN MOSES HELD UP HIS HAND THAT ISRAEL PREVAILED, ETC.⁴ NOW DID THE HANDS OF MOSES WAGE WAR OR CRUSH THE ENEMY?⁵ NOT SO; ONLY THE TEXT SIGNIFIES THAT SO LONG AS ISRAEL TURNED THEIR THOUGHTS ABOVE AND SUBJECTED THEIR HEARTS TO THEIR FATHER IN HEAVEN THEY PREVAILED, BUT OTHERWISE THEY FELL. THE SAME LESSON MAY BE TAUGHT THUS. [IT IS WRITTEN], MAKE THEE A FIERY SERPENT AND SET IT UP ON A POLE, AND IT SHALL COME TO PASS THAT EVERYONE THAT IS BITTEN, WHEN HE SEETH IT, SHALL LIVE.⁶ NOW DID THE SERPENT KILL OR DID THE SERPENT KEEP A LIVE? NO; [WHAT IT INDICATES IS THAT] WHEN ISRAEL TURNED THEIR THOUGHTS ABOVE AND SUBJECTED THEIR HEARTS TO THEIR FATHER IN HEAVEN, THEY WERE HEALED, BUT OTHERWISE THEY PINED AWAY.⁷

A DEAF-MUTE, A LUNATIC AND A MINOR CANNOT PERFORM A RELIGIOUS DUTY ON BEHALF OF A CONGREGATION.⁸ THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ONE WHO IS NOT HIMSELF UNDER OBLIGATION TO PERFORM A RELIGIOUS DUTY CANNOT PERFORM IT ON BEHALF OF A CONGREGATION.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: 'All [males] are under obligation to blow the shofar, Priests, Levites and lay Israelites, proselytes and emancipated slaves, tumtum⁹ and androgynus,¹⁰ and one who is half slave and half free.¹¹ A tumtum cannot perform [a religious duty] either for a fellow-tumtum or for anyone else.¹² An androgynus can perform [a religious duty] for a fellow-androgynus¹³ but nor for anyone else. One who is half a slave and half free can perform [a religious duty] neither for one in the same condition nor for anyone else'.¹⁴

The Master has here said, 'All are under obligation to blow the shofar, Priests, Levites and lay Israelites'. Is not this self-evident? If these have not the duty, who has? — This had to be stated. For you might have argued, Seeing that it is written, A day of blowing the trumpet it shall be to you,¹⁵ this obligation devolves upon those who have not to blow save on one day a year, but since these priests participate in the blowings all through the year, as it is written, And ye shall blow with your trumpets over your burnt-offerings,¹⁶ I might think that they are not bound [to observe this blowing]. Therefore we are told [that this is not so]. Is there any analogy? You cite trumpets and we speak of shofar! No; [what you must say is], This had to be stated. For I might argue that since we have learnt, 'The Jubilee is on the same footing as New Year in respect of blowing the shofar and blessings',¹⁷ those to whom the injunction of the Jubilee applies have to keep the precept of New Year, and since these priests do not come under the obligations of the Jubilee, as we have learnt, 'Priests and Levites may sell at any time and redeem at any time',¹⁸ therefore they are not bound to keep the precept of New Year. Therefore we are told [that this is not so].

'One who is half a slave and half free can perform [a religious duty] neither for one who is in the same condition nor for anyone else'. R. Huna said: He may, however, perform [the duty] for himself. Said R. Nahman to R. Huna: What is the reason why he may not perform [it] for others? Because the side of slavery [in himself] cannot perform [the duty] for the side of freedom [in others]. In regard to himself similarly, the side of slavery should not be able to perform [the duty] for the side of freedom in himself? No, said R. Nahman; he cannot perform [the duty] for himself either. It has been taught to the same effect: One who is half slave and half free cannot perform the [religious duty] even for himself.

Ahabah the son of R. Zera learnt: Any blessing which one has already recited on behalf of himself, he can recite again on behalf of others,¹⁹ save the blessing over bread and the blessing over wine.²⁰ These if he has not yet recited on behalf of himself²¹ he may recite on behalf of others,²² but if he has already recited them for himself he cannot recite them on behalf of others.²³ Raba inquired:

- (1) I.e., to perform consciously for the benefit of the hearer.
- (2) [This is difficult, v. Marginal Glosses, Bezaleel Ronsburg. Read with MS.M.: ‘and it states (in such a case, i.e., where the performer performs for himself provided the hearer puts his mind to it) he performed his duty.]
- (3) Lit., ‘according to his way’; i.e., he need not consciously perform for the benefit of the listener.
- (4) Ex. XVII, 11.
- (5) Lit., ‘break war’.
- (6) Num. XXI, 8.
- (7) This disquisition in the Mishnah is suggested by the references above to ‘religious intention’ (v. Maharsha).
- (8) Lit., ‘cannot take the public out of the power of their obligation’.
- (9) One of uncertain sex.
- (10) A hermaphrodite.
- (11) E.g., a slave of two masters, one of whom has released him.
- (12) Because possibly the tumtum is a female and as no obligation. Lit., ‘either for his own species or not for his own species’.
- (13) In virtue of the male part common to both of them.
- (14) As the slave side of the performer cannot delegate for the free side of the hearer.
- (15) Num. XXIX, 1.
- (16) Ibid. X, 10.
- (17) V. supra 26b.
- (18) ‘Ar. 33b. A better reading is, ‘may sanctify at any time and redeem etc’. (v. Tosaf. s.v. **דַּתְנִי**), the reference being to the right of a priest or Levite to sanctify or redeem at any time a field even if it has been sold by the treasurer of the sanctuary, which was not permissible to a lay Israelite; v. ‘Ar. 26b and 33b.
- (19) Lit., ‘in respect of all other blessings, though he emerged from his responsibility, he can bring (others) forth’. The blessings referred to are those said over the performance of religious precepts, and the reason is that all Israelites are responsible for one another in regard to the performance of religious precepts.
- (20) This includes blessings over food and scents generally, which are only said because it is forbidden to enjoy the goods of this world without a blessing, not because the partaking is a religious duty.
- (21) Lit., ‘if he does not emerge (from his responsibility)’.
- (22) Lit., ‘he brings forth (from their responsibility)’.
- (23) Because, as there is no religious duty involved, he is not responsible for their partaking.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 29b

What is the rule with regard to the blessing for bread said over the mazzah and the blessing for wine said in the sanctification?¹ Do we say that since [the partaking of these] is obligatory, he can perform [the duty] for others, or have we here perhaps only an [optional] blessing, not an obligation?² — Come and hear, since R. Ashi said: When we were at the house of R. Papi, he used to say the sanctification for us, and when his tenants came from the fields he used to make the sanctification for them.³

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not break bread⁴ for visitors unless he eats with them, but he may break bread for his children and the members of his household so as to train them in the performance of religious duties. In the reciting of [the blessing over] Hallel and the Megillah, even though he has already performed [the duty] for himself, he may perform it for others.

CHAPTER IV

MISHNAH. IF THE FESTIVE DAY OF NEW YEAR FELL ON A SABBATH, THEY USED TO BLOW THE SHOFAR IN THE TEMPLE BUT NOT IN THE COUNTRY:⁵ AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE, RABBAN JOHANAN BEN ZACCAI ORDAINED THAT IT SHOULD BE BLOWN [ON SABBATH] IN EVERY PLACE WHERE THERE WAS A BETH DIN. R. ELIEZER SAID: RABBAN JOHANAN BEN ZACCAI LAID DOWN THIS RULE FOR

JABNEH ONLY.⁶ THEY SAID TO HIM: IT APPLIES EQUALLY TO JABNEH AND TO ANY PLACE WHERE THERE IS A BETH DIN. JERUSALEM HAD THIS FURTHER⁷ SUPERIORITY OVER JABNEH, THAT IN EVERY CITY FROM WHICH IT COULD BE SEEN OR HEARD AND WHICH WAS NEAR AND FROM WHICH IT WAS ACCESSIBLE THEY USED TO BLOW [ON SABBATH],⁸ WHEREAS IN JABNEH THEY USED TO BLOW IN THE BETH DIN ONLY.⁹

GEMARA. Whence [in the Scripture] is this rule¹⁰ derived? — R. Levi b. Lahma said: One verse says, a solemn rest, a memorial of blast of horns,¹¹ while another verse says, it is a day of blowing the horn unto you!¹² [Yet] there is no contradiction, as one refers to a festival which falls on Sabbath¹³ and the other to a festival which falls on a weekday. Raba said: If the prohibition [on Sabbath] is from the Written Law, how comes the shofar to be blown in the Temple? And besides, [the blowing] is no work¹⁴ that a text should be needed to except it.¹⁵ For it was taught in the school of Samuel:¹⁶ [When it says], Ye shall do no servile work [on New Year],¹⁷ this excludes the blowing of the shofar and the taking of bread from the oven,¹⁸ these being kinds of skill and not work! — No, said Raba. According to the Written Law it is allowed, and it is the Rabbis who prohibited it as a precaution; as stated by Rabbah; for Rabbah said, All are under obligation to blow the shofar but not all are skilled in the blowing of the shofar. [Hence] there is a danger that perhaps one will take it in his hand [on Sabbath] and go to an expert to learn and carry it four cubits in public domain.¹⁹ The same reason applies to the lulab and the same reason to the Megillah.²⁰

AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE RABBAN JOHANAN BEN ZACCAI ORDAINED etc. Our Rabbis taught: Once New Year fell on a Sabbath [and all the towns assembled],²¹ and Rabban Johanan said to the Bene Bathyra,²² Let us blow the shofar. They said to him, Let us discuss the matter.²³ He said to them, Let us blow and afterwards discuss. After they had blown they said to him, Let us now discuss the question. He replied: The horn has already been heard in Jabneh, and what has been done is no longer open to discussion.²⁴

R. ELIEZER SAID: RABBAN JOHANAN BEN ZACCAI LAID DOWN THIS RULE FOR JABNEH ONLY. THEY SAID TO HIM: IT APPLIES EQUALLY TO JABNEH AND TO ANY PLACE WHERE THERE IS A BETH DIN. [What] THEY SAID TO HIM is the same as the dictum of the first Tanna?²⁵ — There is a difference between them, namely, in the case of a temporary Beth din.²⁶

THEY SAID TO HIM: IT APPLIES EQUALLY TO JABNEH AND TO ANY PLACE WHERE THERE IS A BETH DIN. R. Huna said

(1) The eating of unleavened bread on the first night of Passover and the sanctification of Sabbaths are religious duties and as such have to be prefaced with blessings. In addition, the ordinary blessing is said over the mazzah and the wine as articles of physical enjoyment. Raba's question relates to these latter blessings.

(2) I.e., is the blessing on this occasion on a par with the blessing on other occasions when the partaking is optional?

(3) This would show that in this case the one who recites the blessing over bread and wine, though he had already recited it for himself, can recite it again for others.

(4) I.e., recite the blessing.

(5) Including Jerusalem (Rashi). [Maim.: excluding Jerusalem].

(6) Where there was a 'Great Beth din' or Sanhedrin of seventy-two members. [A small town on the N.W. border of Judah, the Jabneel of Josh. XV, 11. It was a seat of learning as early as the days of R. Gamaliel the Elder. At the request of R. Johanan b. Zaccai it was spared by Vespasian at the time of the destruction of the Temple. when the Great Sanhedrin removed there and was presided over by R. Johanan b. Zaccai.]

(7) The meaning of this expression is discussed in the Gemara.

(8) After the destruction of the Temple.

(9) And not in the surrounding towns.

- (10) That the shofar should not be blown on Sabbath.
- (11) Lev. XXIII, 24.
- (12) Num. XXIX, 1. How reconcile the two texts?
- (13) When there is to be only a 'memorial' or mention of the blowing of the shofar, not actual blowing.
- (14) [Read with MS.M. and Rashi: 'Is it work that etc.'.]
- (15) From the general Prohibition of work on Sabbath.
- (16) [Var. lec., R. Ishmael.]
- (17) Num. XXIX, 1.
- (18) After it is baked. V. Tosaf., s.v. **רדיית**
- (19) But this carrying was not forbidden in the Temple.
- (20) V. Glos,
- (21) To Jabneh in order to hear the blowing of the shofar by the representatives of the Beth din. The brackets appear in the text.
- (22) Descendants of the leaders of the Sanhedrin who resigned their position in favour of Hillel. V. Pes. 66a.
- (23) Whether the prohibition should be extended to a Place where there is a Beth din.
- (24) Lest we should have to stigmatize ourselves as having committed an error.
- (25) That R. Johanan b. Zaccai ordained that the shofar should be blown on Sabbath wherever there was a Beth din.
- (26) The latter authority requires that the Beth dill should be a permanent one like that of Jabneh.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 30a

, [The shofar on Sabbath is blown only] with the Beth din. What is meant by 'with the Beth din'? — In the presence of the Beth din, [and he means] to except [from the permission] any blowing [on Sabbath] not in the presence of the Beth din.

Raba raised the following objection against this view: JERUSALEM HAD THIS FURTHER SUPERIORITY OVER JABNEH etc. What does THIS FURTHER imply? Shall I say that [the text] is to be taken as it stands?¹ Then it should have said THIS simply!² Again, should it imply that in Jerusalem private individuals used to blow and in Jabneh private individuals did not blow, [I would ask,] but did not private individuals blow in Jabneh? When R. Isaac b. Joseph came, did he not report that when the congregational reader had finished blowing in Jabneh, a man could not hear his own voice³ for the noise of the blowing [of individuals]?⁴ What then must be said is that in Jerusalem the shofar was blown whether during the hours when the Beth din sat⁵ or the hours when they did not sit, but in Jabneh it was blown during the hours when they sat but not when they did not sit. You admit then that during the hours when the Beth din sat at any rate they blew away from the Beth din?⁶ — No; [what it implies⁷ is that] in Jerusalem they blew whether in the presence of the Beth din or not in their presence, but in Jabneh they did blow in the presence of the Beth din, but otherwise not.

Some attach R. Huna's dictum to [the exposition of] the text, On the day of Atonement ye shall cause a shofar to pass through all your land,⁸ [thus]: This teaches that every individual is under obligation to blow. R. Huna said: It must be with the Beth din. What is meant by 'with the Beth din'? At the time when the Beth din sits,⁹ to exclude [from the permission] the time when the Beth din does not sit. Raba raised the following objection: The blowing of the shofar on New Year and Jubilee overrides Sabbath in the country¹⁰ [for] a man and his house. What is meant by 'a man and his house'? Shall I say it means a man and his wife? Has then a woman to perform this duty, seeing that it is a duty for which there is a specific time,¹¹ and women are not liable to perform any duties for which there is a specific time? What it therefore must mean is, every man in this house', and even [I presume] during the hours when the Beth din does not sit? — No; it means in fact during the hours when the Beth din does sit.

R. Shesheth raised the following objection [against this view]: 'The Jubilee is on the same footing

as New Year for blowing the shofar and for blessings, only on the Jubilee they blew [on Sabbath] alike in a Beth din in which the New Moon had been sanctified and in a Beth din in which the New Moon had not been sanctified, and every individual was under obligation to blow, whereas on New Year they blew only in a Beth din in which the New Moon had been sanctified and private individuals were not under obligation to blow'. What is meant by 'private individuals were not under obligation to blow'? Shall I say that on the Jubilee individuals used to blow a shofar and on New Year individuals did not blow? [This cannot be], because when R. Isaac b. Joseph came he said that when the congregational reader in Jabneh finished blowing a man could not hear his own voice for the noise [of the blowings] of individuals. It must mean then that on the Jubilee they blow both during the hours when the Beth din sits and also when the Beth din does not sit, but on New Year they blow when the Beth din sits but not when the Beth din does not sit. Now it states here at any rate that on the Jubilee [it is blown] whether when the Beth din is sitting or when it is not sitting?¹² — No; what indeed is meant is, when the Beth din sits, and the statement should be understood thus: On the Jubilee [it is blown] during the hours when the Beth din sits whether in the presence of the Beth din or not in the presence of the Beth din; but on New Year it is blown only when the Beth din sits and in the presence of the Beth din. It has also been stated [elsewhere]: R. Hiyya b. Gamda said in the name of R. Jose b. Saul, who had it from Rabbi: The shofar is blown only during the hours that the Beth din sits.

R. Zera inquired: If they have made ready¹³ to rise, what is the rule? Is it necessary that the Beth din should be still seated, and this condition is fulfilled, or is it necessary that it should be during the sitting of the Beth din, and this condition is not fulfilled? — This question is left undecided.

JERUSALEM HAD THIS FURTHER SUPERIORITY OVER JABNEH etc. FROM WHICH IT COULD BE SEEN: this excludes one situated in a valley. OR HEARD: this excludes one situated on the top of a mountain. OR NEAR: this excludes one situated beyond the Sabbath limit.¹⁴ OR FROM WHICH IT WAS ACCESSIBLE: this excludes one separated from it by a river.

MISHNAH. ORIGINALLY THE LULAB WAS SHAKEN¹⁵ IN THE SANCTUARY DURING SEVEN DAYS AND IN THE COUNTRY ONLY ONE DAY.¹⁶ WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED RABBAN JOHANNAN B. ZACCAI ORDAINED THAT THE LULAB SHOULD BE SHAKEN IN THE COUNTRY SEVEN DAYS, IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE SANCTUARY. [HE] ALSO [ORDAINED] THAT DURING

THE WHOLE OF THE DAY OF THE WAVING [OF THE 'OMER]¹⁷ THE NEW CORN SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN.

GEMARA. What is our warrant for doing things in remembrance of the Temple? — Because the Scripture says, For I will restore health unto thee and I will heal thee of thy wound, saith the Lord, because they have called thee an outcast, 'she is Zion, there is none that inquireth after her'.¹⁸ From this we gather that she ought to be inquired after.

THAT THE WHOLE OF THE DAY OF WAVING THE 'OMER THE NEW CORN SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN. What is the reason? — The Temple, [let us hope], will speedily be rebuilt, and [the Jews] will [then] say, 'Last year did we not eat [the new corn] from daybreak?¹⁹ Now too let us eat', they not knowing that last year when there was no [waving of the] 'omer it was daybreak which rendered the new corn permissible, but now that there is the 'omer it is the 'omer which renders it permissible. When [are we supposing] it will be built? Shall I say it will be built on the sixteenth [of Nisan]? Then daybreak [of the sixteenth] will render the new corn permissible.²⁰ Shall I say then that it will be built on the fifteenth?²¹ Then let [the new corn] become Permissible from midday [on the sixteenth], since we have learnt: 'Those who are at a distance [from the Temple] are allowed to eat [the new corn] from midday, because the Beth din do not procrastinate [with the 'omer]'²² -The rule

is necessary in case the Temple will be built on the fifteenth shortly before sunset,²³ or also in case it will be built by night.²⁴

R. Nahman b. Isaac [however] said: Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai

-
- (1) I.e., that there is no omission to be supplied.
 - (2) Because no superiority has so far been mentioned.
 - (3) Lit., 'ears'. [MS.M.: voice in his ears'.]
 - (4) In the text the words 'of individuals' are in brackets.
 - (5) I.e., till six hours (midday) — Rashi.
 - (6) Which refutes R. Huna's statement that in Jabneh the permission to blow on Sabbath was only in the presence of the Beth dill.
 - (7) As to the superiority of Jerusalem.
 - (8) Lev. XXV, 9.
 - (9) And not, as above, in the presence of the Beth din, this being excluded by through all your land including places where there is no Beth din.
 - (10) Lit., 'the borders', i.e., outside the Sanctuary.
 - (11) Lit., 'which time causes (its observance)'.]
 - (12) Which is contrary to the opinion of R. Huna as explained above.
 - (13) Lit., 'shaken themselves'.
 - (14) I.e., more than two thousand cubits from the wall of Jerusalem.
 - (15) Lit., 'taken', 'lifted up'. On lulab v. Glos.
 - (16) V Suk. 41a.
 - (17) I.e., the sixteenth of Nisan; v. Glos. s.V.
 - (18) Jer. XXX, 17.
 - (19) The text says, Ye shall not eat bread . . . until this selfsame day, until ye have brought the offering (of the 'omer). — Lev. XXIII, 14. The Rabbis learn from this (Men. 68), that when the 'omer is brought the new corn may be eaten as soon as it is brought, and when it is not brought the new corn may be eaten from daybreak on the sixteenth of Nisan.
 - (20) The Temple not yet having been built.
 - (21) [I.e., it will have been built by the fifteenth so that there would be time to make all the preparation necessary for the offering of the 'omer v. Rashi Suk. 41a.]
 - (22) And it may be safely assumed that they have brought it by midday.
 - (23) [The law that the building of the Temple does not override the Sabbath (v. Sheb. 15b) does not apply to the future Temple which will be wrought by the hands of Heaven (Rashi). MS.M. (v. also Tosaf. Suk. 41a S.V. **וְשֵׁשׁ**) omit fifteenth, the reference being to the fourteenth day before sunset when there would not be ample time to provide for many of the preliminaries to the offering of the 'omer, which had to be attended to on the eve of the Festival (v. Men. 65a).]
 - (24) And in such a case there will not be time to bring the 'omer by midday, and if the Jews should eat the new corn then they will transgress.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 30b

based his rule on the view enunciated [later] by R. Judah, who said: [Ye shall neither eat bread . . .] until this selfsame day:¹ this means, until the termination² of the day, and he was of the opinion that the expression 'until' is inclusive [of its object]. But did Rabban Johanan concur with him [R. Judah]? Did he not join issue with him, as we have learnt:³ 'When the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai ordained that during the whole of the day of waving the 'omer the new corn should be forbidden. Said R. Judah: Is it not forbidden from the Torah, [as it is written, until this selfsame day]?⁴ — On that occasion it was R. Judah who made a mistake. He thought that Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai declared it only Rabbinically forbidden, but this is not the case: he declared it forbidden from the Pentateuch. But it is stated that 'he ordained'?⁵ — What is meant [here] by 'ordained'? It means, he expounded [the text] and ordained'.⁶

MISHNAH. ORIGINALLY THEY USED TO ACCEPT TESTIMONY WITH REGARD TO THE NEW MOON DURING THE WHOLE OF THE DAY. ON ONE OCCASION⁷ THE WITNESSES WERE LATE IN ARRIVING, AND THE LEVITES WENT WRONG IN THE DAILY HYMN.⁸ IT WAS THEREFORE ORDAINED THAT TESTIMONY SHOULD BE ACCEPTED [ON NEW YEAR] ONLY UNTIL

THE AFTERNOON SACRIFICE, AND THAT IF WITNESSES CAME AFTER THE AFTERNOON SACRIFICE THAT DAY⁹ SHOULD BE KEPT AS HOLY¹⁰ AND ALSO THE NEXT DAY. AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE RABBAN JOHANAN B. ZACCAI ORDAINED THAT TESTIMONY WITH REGARD TO THE NEW MOON SHOULD BE RECEIVED DURING THE WHOLE OF THE DAY.

GEMARA. How did the Levites go wrong in the daily Psalm?¹¹ — Here [in Babylon] it was explained that they did not say any psalm at all.¹² R. Zera, however, said that they recited the weekday psalm along with the regular sacrifice of the afternoon.¹³ Said R. Zera to Ahabah his son: Go and cite to them [the Babylonians] [the following Baraitha]: ‘They made a rule that testimony with regard to the new moon should not be received unless there was still time left to offer the regular sacrifices and the additional sacrifices and their drink-offerings and to recite the psalm without confusion’.¹⁴ Now if you hold that they said the weekday psalm, we understand how there is a possibility of confusion, but if they did not say any psalm at all, how could there be confusion? — Since they did not say a psalm at all, there could be no confusion¹⁵ greater than this.

R. Aha b. Huna raised the following objection [against this latter view]: The regular morning sacrifice on New Year is offered in the usual way.¹⁶ Over the additional sacrifice what psalm is said? [The one commencing], Sing aloud unto God our strength, make a teru'ah¹⁷ unto the God of Jacob.¹⁸ At the afternoon sacrifice what did they say? [The psalm containing the words], The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness.¹⁹ When New Year fell on a Thursday, for which the regular psalm is ‘Sing aloud unto God our strength’,²⁰ they did not say ‘Sing aloud’ at the morning service because the same section was afterwards repeated. What then did they say? I removed his shoulder from the burden.²¹ If, however, witnesses came after the regular morning sacrifice,²² they said ‘Sing aloud’, although the verse might afterwards have to be repeated’. Now if you hold that wherever there is a doubt we say the weekday psalm, we understand the statement here that ‘it might be repeated’. But if you hold that they said no psalm at all, what is meant by repeating it? —

(1) Lev. XXIII, 14.

(2) Heb. **עצמו של יום** lit., ‘the very self of the day’.

(3) Men. 68b.

(4) These words in the text are bracketed.

(5) Heb. **התקין** a term usually applied to ordinances of the Rabbis not derived from the written text.

(6) That henceforth they should be forbidden to eat the new corn the whole of the sixteenth, this being an injunction of the Scripture.

(7) On the occasion of a New Year (Rashi).

(8) The meaning of this is discussed infra in the Gemara.

(9) I.e., the thirtieth day of the month.

(10) In point of fact it had already been kept as holy from the previous sunset, out of doubt. The rest of it was now to be kept as holy, although the New Moon would not be sanctified till to-morrow, the thirty-first day, which naturally would also be holy. The reason why the rest of the thirtieth day was declared holy was as a precaution lest, if the public were allowed to keep this part as a weekday, they might in future years keep the whole day as a weekday on the assumption that after all the witnesses would not come, or not come till late (Rashi).

(11) Lit., ‘song’. It was the custom for the Levites to chant a psalm while the drink-offering accompanying the daily sacrifices was being offered, as explained in the Gemara infra.

(12) Being in doubt whether to recite the festival psalm or that of the weekday, V. infra.

- (13) Whereas, since the day was eventually declared holy, they should have recited the festival psalm. [No special psalm was instituted to be recited in connection with the morning sacrifice on New Year as witnesses rarely came so early.]
- (14) The Hebrew word is שִׁבּוּשׁ which R. Zera apparently understands in the sense of 'gabbling'.
- (15) The word שִׁבּוּשׁ being taken in the sense of 'error'.
- (16) I.e., it is accompanied by the weekday psalm, v. p. 144, n. 5.
- (17) E.V. 'shout'.
- (18) Ps. LXXXI, 2. The words 'make a teru'ah' were of course appropriate to the day of teru'ah, — New Year.
- (19) Ps. XXIX, 8. This verse is reminiscent of the shofar blown at the giving of the Law.
- (20) V. infra, in the list of the daily psalms.
- (21) Ps. LXXXI, 7. This verse was said because it refers to Joseph who was supposed to have been liberated on New Year (v. supra 11a). Apparently the latter half of this psalm was said with the morning sacrifice and the first half with the additional sacrifice.
- (22) So that at the time of the sacrifice they did not yet know if the day would be holy.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 31a

There the case is different, because it is the psalm of the day.¹

It has been taught: 'R. Judah said in the name of R. Akiba: On the first day [of the week] what [psalm] did they [the Levites] say? [The one commencing] The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof,² because He took possession and gave possession³ and was [sole] ruler in His universe.⁴ On the second day what did they say? [The one commencing], Great is the Lord and highly to be praised,⁵ because he divided His works⁶ and reigned over them like a king.⁷ On the third day they said, God standeth in the congregation of God,⁸ because He revealed the earth in His wisdom and established the world for His community.⁹ On the fourth day they said, O Lord, Thou God, to whom vengeance belongeth,¹⁰ because He created the sun and the moon and will one day punish those who serve them. On the fifth day they said, Sing aloud to the God of our strength,¹¹ because He created fishes and birds to praise His name.¹² On the sixth day they said, The Lord reigneth, He is clothed in majesty,¹³ because He completed His work and reigned over His creatures. On the seventh day they said, A psalm a song for the Sabbath day,¹⁴ to wit, for the day which will be all Sabbath.¹⁵ Said R. Nehemiah: What ground had the Sages¹⁶ for making a difference between these sections?¹⁷ No. On the first day [the reason for the psalm said is] because He took possession and gave possession and was [sole] ruler in His world; on the second day because He divided and ruled over them; on the third day because He revealed the earth in His wisdom and established the world for His community; on the fourth day, because He created the sun and the moon and will one day punish those who serve them; on the fifth day because He created birds and fishes to praise His name; on the sixth day because He completed His work and reigned over His creatures; on the seventh day, because He rested. The point at issue between them¹⁸ is whether to accept or not the dictum of R. Kattina; for R. Kattina said: The world is to last six thousand years, and one thousand it will be desolate, as it says, And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.¹⁹ Abaye, however, said: It will be desolate two thousand, as it says, After two days He will revive us.²⁰

At the additional sacrifice of Sabbath what did they say? — R. Anan²¹ b. Raba said in the name of Rab: Hazyw Lak.²² R. Hanan b. Raba said also in the name of Rab: As these sections are divided here, so they are divided [when read on Sabbath] in the synagogue.²³ At the afternoon sacrifice of Sabbath what did they say? — R. Johanan said: Then sang,²⁴ and Who is like thee,²⁵ and Then sang.²⁶

The question was raised: Were all these portions said on each Sabbath, or was only one said on every Sabbath? — Come and hear, since it has been taught: 'R. Jose said: By the time the first of these sections²⁷ has come round once, the second has come round twice'.²⁸ This shows that each Sabbath one portion was said: and this may be taken as proved.

R. Judah b. Idi said in the name of R. Johanan: The Divine Presence [so to speak] left Israel by ten stages²⁹ — this we know from references in Scripture — and the Sanhedrin correspondingly wandered to ten places of banishment³⁰ — this we know from tradition. ‘The Divine Presence left Israel by ten stages — this we know from references in Scripture’: [it went] from the Ark-cover to the Cherub³¹ and from the Cherub to the threshold [of the Holy of Holies], and from the threshold to the court, and from the court to the altar,³² and from the altar to the roof [of the Temple], and from the roof to the wall, and from the wall to the town, and from the town to the mountain, and from the mountain to the wilderness, and from the wilderness it ascended and abode in its own place,³³ as it says, I will go and return to my place.³⁴ ‘From the Ark-cover to the Cherub³⁵ and from the Cherub to the threshold’, as it is written, And there will I meet with thee . . . from above the ark-cover,³⁶ and it is written, And the glory of the Lord was gone up from the cherub whereupon it was to the threshold of the house.³⁷ ‘And from the threshold to the court’, as it is written, And the house was filled with the cloud, and the court was full of the brightness of the Lord's glory,³⁸ ‘From the court to the altar’, as it is written, I saw the Lord standing on the altar.³⁹ ‘And from the altar to the roof’, as it is written, It is better to dwell it, a corner of the housetop [than in a house in common with a contentious woman].⁴⁰ ‘From the roof to the wall’, as it is written, Behold, the Lord stood by a wall made by a plumbline.⁴¹ ‘From the wall to the town’, as it is written, The voice of the Lord crieth unto the city.⁴² ‘And from the city to the mountain’, as it is written, And the glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city.⁴³ ‘And from the mountain to the wilderness as it is written, It is better to dwell in a desert land [than with a contentious woman].⁴⁴ ‘And from the wilderness it went and abode in its own place’, as it is written, I shall go and return to my place until they acknowledge their guilt.⁴⁵

R. Johanan said: The Divine Presence tarried for Israel in the wilderness six months in the hope that they would repent. When [it saw that] they did not repent, it said, Let their soul expire, as it says, But the eyes of the wicked shall fail and they shall have no way to flee and their hope shall be the expiry of the soul.⁴⁶

‘Correspondingly the Sanhedrin wandered to ten places of banishment, as we know from tradition’, namely, from the Chamber of Hewn Stone⁴⁷ to Hanuth,⁴⁸ and from Hanuth to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Jabneh,⁴⁹

(1) And therefore was said in spite of the doubt.

(2) Ps. XXIV, 1.

(3) To the sons of men (Rashi), cf. Ps. CXV, 16. Maharsha: He made something which could subsequently be acquired, as it says, ‘Who shall go up in the Mount of the Lord’ etc.

(4) I.e., without angels, who were created on the second day.

(5) Ps. XLVIII, 2.

(6) I.e., the upper and lower worlds.

(7) This apparently means, reigned over the lower world from the heavens, referred to in the psalm as ‘beautiful in elevation in the city of a great king’. [R. Hananel: Thus did He set aside Jerusalem to become ‘the city of our God, the mountain of his holiness’.]

(8) Ps. LXXXII.

(9) Cf. Gen. I, 9.

(10) Ps. XCIV.

(11) Ps. LXXXI, 2.

(12) I.e., to manifest His glory.

(13) Ps. XCIII.

(14) Ps. XCII.

(15) When God shall be alone, between the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead (Rashi).

(16) Var. lec., ‘R. Akiba’, who in any case is meant.

- (17) Viz., the psalms for the first six days, all of which they take to refer to the past, and that for the seventh day, which they take to refer to the future.
- (18) R. Akiba and R. Nehemiah.
- (19) Isa. II, 11. A 'day' of God is reckoned as a thousand years, on the basis of Ps. XC, 4, 'For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday'; v. Sanh. 97a.
- (20) Hos. VI, 2. Cf. p. 146, n. 11, R. Nehemiah holds with Abaye, and therefore cannot refer to this period as a Sabbath day.
- (21) Var. lec. Hanan.
- (22) Mnemonic (lit., 'the splendour of thine'). I.e., Ha'azinu, (give ear), Zekor, (remember), Yarkibehu (He made him ride), Wayar (and he saw), Lule (but that), Ki (when), the first words of verses 1, 7, 13, 19, 27 and 36 in Deut. XXXII, the 'Song of Ha'azinu'.
- (23) I.e., the divisions of the sidra are at the same verses.
- (24) The 'song of Moses', Ex. XV, up to v. 9.
- (25) The rest of the song of Moses.
- (26) The 'song of the well', Num. XXI, 17ff
- (27) I.e., Ha'azinu.
- (28) Because the first had six portions and the second three.
- (29) Lit., 'made ten journeys', before the destruction of the first Temple.
- (30) Before and after the destruction of the second Temple.
- (31) The text here incorrectly inserts, 'and from one cherub to the other'.
- (32) Of sacrifice.
- (33) I.e., heaven.
- (34) Hos. V, 15.
- (35) The text here incorrectly inserts, 'and from one cherub to the other'.
- (36) Ex. XXV, 22. This shows that the original abode of the Shechinah was over the ark-cover. The text here inserts, 'and it is written, And he rode upon a cherub and did fly' (II Sam. XXII, 11), which is omitted by Rashi.
- (37) Ezek. IX, 3, describing the departure of the divine glory from the Temple.
- (38) Ibid. X, 4.
- (39) Amos IX, I. These words were spoken long before the destruction of the Temple, but they are taken by the Talmud as prophetic.
- (40) Prov. XXI, 9. These words are put by the Talmud in the mouth of the Shechinah, the 'contentious woman' being the idol which was placed in the Temple.
- (41) Amos VII, 7. Cf. supra n. 8.
- (42) Micah VI, 9. Cf. supra n. 8.
- (43) Ezek. XI, 23.
- (44) Prov. XXI, 19. Cf. supra n. 9.
- (45) Hos. V, 15.
- (46) Job. XI, 20.
- (47) [Lishkath ha-Gazith in the inner court of the Temple, v. J.E. XII, p. 576].
- (48) Lit., 'shop', 'bazaar', to which the Sanhedrin removed when they ceased to judge capital cases. [Hanuth was a place on the Temple Mount outside the Chamber of Hewn Stone. Derenbourg, Essai p. 467, identifies it with the Chamber of the Sons of Hanan (a powerful priestly family, cf. Jer. XXXV, 4) mentioned in J. Pe'ah 1,5.]
- (49) Jamnia, in Judea. This was in the time of R. Johanan b. Zaccai.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 31b

and from Jabneh to Usha,¹ and from Usha [back] to Jabneh, and from Jabneh [back] to Usha, and from Usha to Shefar'am,² and from Shefar'am to Beth She'arim, and from Beth She'arim to Sepphoris, and from Sepphoris to Tiberias,³ and Tiberias is the lowest-lying of them all,⁴ as it says, And brought down thou shalt speak out of the ground.⁵ R. Eleazar says: There were six banishments, as it says, For he hath brought down them that dwell on high, the lofty city, laying it low, laying it low even to the ground, bringing it even to the dust.⁶ Said R. Johanan: And from there they are

destined to be redeemed, as it says, Shake thyself from the dust, arise.⁷

MISHNAH. R. JOSHUA B. KORHA SAID: THIS FURTHER

REGULATION DID R. JOHANAN B. ZACCAI MAKE, THAT SHOULD THE HEAD OF THE BETH DIN BE IN SOME OTHER PLACE THE WITNESSES SHOULD STILL PROCEED ONLY TO THE PLACE OF THE ASSEMBLY.⁸

GEMARA. A certain woman was summoned to appear before Amemar in Nehardea. Meanwhile Amemar went to Mahuza, but she did not follow him. He accordingly wrote out a summons [under the penalty of the ban]⁹ against her. Said R. Ashi to Amemar: [Is this right] seeing that we have learnt: SHOULD THE HEAD OF THE BETH DIN BE IN SOME OTHER PLACE THE WITNESSES SHOULD STILL PROCEED ONLY TO THE PLACE OF THE ASSEMBLY? — He replied: This refers only to the testimony with regard to the new moon, and [the reason for it is that] if this¹⁰ [were to be insisted on], the result might be to put a stumbling block in their way for the future;¹¹ but in this case, the borrower is a servant to the lender.¹²

Our Rabbis have taught: ‘The priests are not permitted to ascend the duchan¹³ in their sandals, and this is one of the nine regulations laid down by Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai’. [What are these nine?] — Six mentioned in this chapter¹⁴ and one in the preceding chapter¹⁵ and the following one, as it has been taught: ‘One who becomes a proselyte at the present time¹⁶ must set aside a quarter¹⁷ for a nest of pigeons’.¹⁸ Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar: Rabban Johanan took a vote on it and annulled this rule, because it may lead to wrongdoing.¹⁹ As to the last,²⁰ there is a difference of opinion between R. Papa and R. Nahman b. Isaac. R. Papa said it was [the regulation] regarding a vine of the fourth year, whereas R. Nahman b. Isaac said it was the one regarding the thread²¹ of scarlet. ‘R. Papa said it was the regulation regarding the vine of the fourth year’, for we have learnt: [The fruit of] a vine in the fourth year was taken to Jerusalem from any point within a day's journey on all sides.²² The boundary of this area was as follows: Elath on the north, Akrabath on the south,²³ Lydda on the west, and Jordan on the east’. [In reference to this] ‘Ulla (or as some say, Rabbah b. ‘Ulla) said in the name of R. Johanan: What was the reason? To decorate the streets of Jerusalem with fruit.²⁴ It has been further taught: ‘R. Eliezer had a vine in its fourth year east of Lydda²⁵ at the side of Kefar Tabi, and R. Eliezer had a mind to declare it free to the poor,²⁶ but his disciples said to him, Rabbi, your colleagues have already taken a vote on it and declared it permitted’.²⁷ Who are his ‘colleagues’? — Rabban Johanan b. Zacca.

‘R. Nahman b. Isaac said it was the tongue of scarlet’, as it has been taught: ‘Originally they used to fasten the thread of scarlet on the door of the [Temple] court on the outside.²⁸ If it turned white the people used to rejoice,²⁹ and if it did not turn white they were sad. They therefore made a rule that it should be fastened to the door of the court on the inside. People, however, still peeped in and saw, and if it turned white they rejoiced and if it did not turn white they were sad. They therefore made a rule that half of it should be fastened to the rock and half between the horns of the goat that was sent [to the wilderness]’. Why did not R. Nahman b. Isaac accept the view of R. Papa? — He could reply: If you assume that it was R. Johanan b. Zaccai [who made the rule about the vine], was he the colleague of R. Eliezer? He was his teacher! [What replies] the other [to this]? — Since they were his disciples [who reported the rule to him], it was not polite of them to say to their teacher, ‘your teacher’. Why did not R. Papa accept the view of R. Nahman b. Isaac? — He could reply: If you assume It was R. Johanan b. Zaccai [who made the rule], was there in the days of R. Johanan b. Zaccai a thread of scarlet [which turned white]? Has it not been taught: ‘R. Johanan b. Zaccai lived altogether a hundred and twenty years. For forty years he was in business, forty years he studied, and forty years he taught’, and it has further been taught: ‘For forty years before the destruction of the Temple the thread of scarlet never turned white but it remained red’.³⁰ Further, the statement of the Mishnah is, ‘After the destruction of the Temple R. Johanan b. Zaccai made a rule’.³¹ [What says]

the other [to this]? — During those forty years that he studied³² his status was that of a disciple sitting before his teacher, and he would offer a suggestion and make good his reasons

(1) This was in the time of Rabban Gamaliel II.

(2) The last three in the time of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel. [The Sanhedrin met at Usha mostly after the Hadrianic persecutions, and apparently ceased functioning during the reign of Verus, and re-established in Shefar'am under Marcus Aurelius; v. Horowitz, Palestine, p. 34.]

(3) The last three were in the time of Rabbi.

(4) Being on Lake Galilee below sea-level. This is a figurative way of saying that at Tiberias the authority of the Sanhedrin sank to its lowest level.

(5) Isa. XXIX, 4.

(6) Ibid. XXVI, 5. The six are (i) he hath brought down, (ii) laying it low, (iii) laying it low, (iv) even to the ground, (v) bringing it, (vi) even to the dust.

(7) Ibid. LII, 2.

(8) And the Beth din should declare the New Moon hallowed without the head, though by rights this was his privilege, v. sura 24a.

(9) Heb. פתיחה lit., 'opening' of legal proceedings.

(10) Viz., that they should go after the head.

(11) As the messengers will refrain from going to all this trouble in order to give evidence.

(12) Quoted from Prov. XXII, 7.

(13) V. Glos.

(14) Viz., (i) that the shofar should be blown on Sabbath wherever there is a Beth din, (ii) that the lulab should be taken in the provinces seven days, (iii) that new corn should be forbidden the whole of the sixteenth of Nisan, (iv) that testimony with regard to the new moon should be received the whole day, (v) that witnesses should go only to the place of assembly, (vi) and that the priests should not ascend the duchan in their sandals. [Read with R. Hananel: 'One, the one (first stated), five in this chapter'.]

(15) That the witnesses should be allowed to profane Sabbath only for Nisan and Tishri, v. supra 21b.

(16) I.e., when there is no Temple.

(17) It is not certain whether this means a quarter of a shekel (= half a denar) or a quarter of a denar. V. Tosaf. s.v. רובע .

(18) While the Temple stood a new convert had to bring a sacrifice (v. Ker. 9a), a couple of pigeons being the smallest, and after the destruction of the Temple the Rabbis still insisted on his bringing them in case the Temple should be rebuilt.

(19) Because the money set aside might be used for secular purposes.

(20) Lit., 'and the other'.

(21) Lit., tongue'. The explanation follows immediately.

(22) According to Lev. XIX, 24 fruit produced by a tree in its fourth year was to be 'holy for giving praise to the Lord' and the Rabbis interpreted this to mean that it was to be consumed in Jerusalem. If, however, the tree was not in the Jerusalem district, the money value of the fruit could be taken to Jerusalem instead of the fruit itself.

(23) [Mishnah M.Sh. V, 2 reverses: Elath on the south, Akrabath on the north. Akrabath is perhaps the modern Akrabah twenty-five miles north of Jerusalem, and Elath is identified with (a) Eleutheropolis (Horowitz, Palestine, p. 41) (b) Beth Elonim near Hebron (Klein, D.J. s.v.).]

(24) Hence all this area was put by the Rabbis under the same rule as Jerusalem itself.

(25) I.e., between Lydda and Jerusalem.

(26) So as not to have the trouble of taking it to Jerusalem.

(27) Because as there was no longer a Temple, there was no point any more in decorating the streets of Jerusalem.

(28) After the High Priest had performed the service on the Day of Atonement. V. Yoma, 67a.

(29) This being a sign that their sins had been forgiven.

(30) When then could R. Johanan have had an opportunity of making this rule?

(31) This applies presumably to all his rules and regulations.

(32) While the Temple still existed.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 32a

and his teacher would make it a definite rule in his name.

MISHNAH. THE ORDER OF BLESSINGS [IN THE MUSAF 'AMIDAH¹ IS AS FOLLOWS]: [THE READER SAYS THE BLESSING OF] THE PATRIARCHS,² [THAT OF] MIGHTINESS³ AND THAT OF THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE NAME⁴ AND INCLUDES THE KINGSHIP-VERSES⁵ WITH THEM AND DOES NOT BLOW THE SHOFAR. HE THEN SAYS THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE DAY⁶ AND BLOWS, THE REMEMBRANCE-VERSES⁵ AND BLOWS, AND THE SHOFAR-VERSES⁵ AND BLOWS; AND HE THEN SAYS THE BLESSING OF THE TEMPLE SERVICE⁷ AND THE ONE OF THANKSGIVING⁸ AND THE BLESSING OF THE PRIESTS.⁹ THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. JOHANAN B. NURI. SAID R. AKIBA TO HIM: IF HE DOES NOT BLOW THE SHOFAR FOR THE KINGSHIP-VERSES, WHY SHOULD HE SAY THEM? NO; [THE RULE IS AS FOLLOWS]. HE SAYS [THE BLESSING OF] THE PATRIARCHS AND OF THE RESURRECTION AND OF THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE NAME, AND SAYS THE KINGSHIP-VERSES ALONG WITH THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE DAY AND BLOWS THE SHOFAR, THEN HE SAYS THE REMEMBRANCE-VERSES AND BLOWS, AND THE SHOFAR-VERSES AND BLOWS. THEN HE SAYS THE TEMPLE SERVICE BLESSING AND THE THANKSGIVING AND THE BLESSING OF THE PRIEST.

GEMARA. SAID R. AKIBA TO HIM, IF HE DOES NOT BLOW THE SHOFAR FOR THE KINGSHIP-VERSES, WHY DOES HE SAY THEM? [He asks], Why does he say them! But the All-Merciful enjoined that they should be said!¹⁰ — What he really means is, why say ten verses? Why not only nine,¹¹ because if there is a difference [in one particular]¹² so there may as well be a difference [in another]?¹³

Our Rabbis taught: Whence do we learn in the Scripture that we are to say [the blessing of] the Patriarchs? Because it says, Ascribe unto the Lord, O ye sons of might.¹⁴ And whence do we learn that we say the blessing of mightiness? Because it says, Ascribe unto the Lord glory and strength.¹⁵ And whence that we say sanctifications? Because it says, Ascribe unto the Lord the glory of his name, worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.¹⁶ Whence do we learn that we are to say kingship, remembrance and shofar¹⁷ [verses]? R. Eliezer says: Because it is written, a solemn rest, a memorial proclaimed with the blast of trumpets, a holy convocation.¹⁸ 'A solemn rest': this indicates the sanctification of the day. 'A memorial': this indicates remembrance verses. 'Proclaimed with the blast of horns': this indicates shofar verses. 'A holy convocation': sanctify it by [abstaining from] the doing of work. Said R. Akiba to him: Why should we not interpret 'a solemn rest' to apply to the abstention from work, seeing that the text placed this first?¹⁹ No; [we should interpret thus]: 'A solemn rest': sanctify it by [abstaining from] the doing of work — 'A memorial': this indicates the remembrance verses. 'Proclaimed with the blowing of horns': this indicates shofar-verses. 'A holy convocation': this indicates the sanctification of the day. Whence [then] do we learn that we say kingship-verses? — It has been taught: Rabbi says, I am the Lord your God,²⁰ [and immediately afterwards], In the seventh month,²¹ this [juxtaposition]²² indicates kingship-verses. R. Jose b. Judah said: There is no need [of such an interpretation]. For Scripture says, And they [the trumpets] shall be to you for a memorial before your God.²³ This makes superfluous [the succeeding words], I am the Lord your God. What then is the point of the words, I am the Lord your God? This creates a general pattern²⁴ for all places where we say remembrance verses, [to show] that kingship verses should accompany them.

Where is the blessing of the sanctification of the day to be said? — It has been taught: Rabbi says, It should be said with the kingship verses. For just as on every other occasion²⁵ we find that it comes fourth [in the order of blessings], so here it should come fourth. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says: It should be said with the remembrance verses. Just as we find that on all other occasions it is said in

the middle,²⁶ so here it should be in the middle.²⁷

When the Beth din sanctified the New Moon in Usha, R. Johanan b. Beroka went down [before the ark]²⁸ in the presence of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, and read as prescribed by R. Johanan b. Nuri.²⁹ Rabban Simeon said to him: That was not the way they used to do in Jabneh.³⁰ On the second day, R. Hanina the son of R. Jose the Galilean went down and read as prescribed by R. Akiba.³¹ Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel said: So they used to do in Jabneh. This would seem to show that R. Simeon b. Gamaliel was of the same opinion as R. Akiba. But [how can this be seeing that] R. Akiba said that the kingship verses are to be joined with the sanctification of the day, whereas R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said that the sanctification of the day is to be joined with the remembrance verses? — R. Zera replied: What it indicates is that [in R. Simeon's opinion] the shofar is blown with the kingship verses.

‘On the second day R. Hanina went down’. What is meant by ‘second’? Shall I say, the second day of the holyday, which would imply that Elul had been prolonged?³² [But this cannot be] seeing that R. Hanina b. Kahana has said that from the time of Ezra there has been no case known of Elul being prolonged? R. Hisda replied: What is meant by ‘second’? It means the same holyday in the next year.

MISHNAH. THERE SHOULD BE RECITED NOT LESS THAN TEN KINGSHIP VERSES, TEN REMEMBRANCE VERSES, AND TEN SHOFAR VERSES. R. JOHANAN B. NURI SAID: IF THE READER SAYS THREE FROM EACH SET³³ HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

GEMARA. To what do these ten kingship verses correspond? — R. Levi said, To the ten praises that David uttered in the book of Psalms. But there are a large number of praises there? — It means, those among which occurs, Praise him with the blowing of the shofar.³⁴ R. Joseph said: To the ten commandments that were spoken to Moses on Sinai.³⁵ R. Johanan said: To the ten Utterances by means of which the world was created.³⁶ Which are they? The phrase ‘and he said’ occurs in the account of the creation only nine times? — The words ‘in the beginning’ are also an utterance, as it is written, By the word of the Lord the heavens were made.³⁷

R. JOHANAN B. NURI SAID: IF HE SAYS THREE OF EACH SET HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. The question was raised: How is this to be understood? Three from the Pentateuch, three from the Prophets and three from the Writings, which would make nine [for each set], so that there is a difference of one between the two authorities, or is it one from the Pentateuch, one from the Prophets and one from the Writings,³⁸ making three for each set, so that they differ considerably? — Come and hear, since it has been taught: ‘There must be recited not less than ten kingship verses, ten remembrance verses, and ten shofar verses, but one who said seven of all of them has fulfilled his obligation, these corresponding to seven firmaments. R. Johanan b. Nuri said: The lowest number one should say is seven,³⁹ but if he said [even] three of them he has fulfilled his obligation, **these corresponding to the Torah, the Prophets and the Writings,** or, as others report, to Priests, Levites, and lay Israelites’. R. Huna said in the name of Samuel: The halachah is as laid down by R. Johanan b. Nuri.

MISHNAH. NO MENTION IS MADE OF KINGSHIP, REMEMBRANCE AND SHOFAR VERSES THAT SIGNIFY PUNISHMENT. IT IS PROPER TO BEGIN WITH THE TORAH⁴⁰ AND CONCLUDE WITH THE PROPHETS. R. JOSE SAID: IF ONE CONCLUDES WITH THE TORAH HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.

(1) On New Year, v. P.B. pp. 245-254; on Musaf and ‘Amidah, v. Glos.

(2) The one ending, ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord, shield of Abraham’.

(3) Lit., ‘mightinesses’: the one ending ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord, who revivest the dead’.

- (4) The one ending, 'the holy king'. These are the first three benedictions of every 'Amidah. V. P.B. pp. 44-45.
- (5) Ten verses, v. infra.
- (6) The passage ending, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost sanctify Israel and the day of memorial'.
- (7) The passage ending, 'Blessed art thou . . . who restorest thy divine presence to Zion'.
- (8) The one ending, 'Blessed art thou . . . to thee it is fitting to give thanks'.
- (9) Which precede the last benediction of every 'Amidah, v. P.B. p. 53.
- (10) As explained infra.
- (11) I.e., three each from the Torah, the Prophets and the Writings.
- (12) Viz., in the blowing of the shofar.
- (13) So as to have nine verses instead of ten.
- (14) Ps. XXIX, 1. By 'the sons of might' the Patriarchs are understood.
- (15) Ibid.
- (16) Ibid. 2.
- (17) Heb. Malkeyoth, Zikronoth, Shoferoth.
- (18) Lev. XXIII, 24.
- (19) And abstention from work is the first mark of the day.
- (20) Lev. XXIII, 22.
- (21) Ibid. 24.
- (22) The intervening words, And the Lord spoke unto Moses saying, Speak unto the children of Israel saying, are not counted.
- (23) Num. X, 10.
- (24) Lit., 'this builds a father'.
- (25) I.e., in the 'Amidah of the other festivals.
- (26) I.e., it is the fourth out of seven blessings that constitute the 'Amidah of the festivals except the one in question.
- (27) I.e., it should be the fifth, as the New Year Musaf 'Amidah has nine blessings.
- (28) To act as reader.
- (29) I.e., he joined the kingship verses with the third blessing and did not blow the shofar after them. V. Mishnah.
- (30) In the days of his father Rabban Gamaliel, when the seat of the Sanhedrin was in Jabneh.
- (31) I. e., he joined the kingship verses with the sanctification of the day and blew the shofar after them. V. Mishnah.
- (32) So that the thirtieth day was kept as New Moon out of doubt, but the new month was not sanctified till the thirty-first.
- (33) The meaning of this is discussed infra in the Gemara.
- (34) Ps. CL, 3.
- (35) Because these were prefaced by the blowing of the shofar.
- (36) New Year being the anniversary of the creation.
- (37) Ps. XXXIII, 6. Hence the first verse of Genesis is equivalent to 'In the beginning God said, Let there be heaven and earth'.
- (38) And we translate in the Mishnah, 'three in all', i.e., in each set of the kingship, remembrance and shofar verses.
- (39) Obviously this means seven altogether in each set.
- (40) Pentateuch.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 32b

GEMARA. [What are] KINGSHIP VERSES [signifying punishment]? — For instance, As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm and with fury poured out will I be king over you,¹ and although R. Nahman said, Let the Holy One, blessed be He, be as furious as all this with us so only that He [finally] redeem us, yet since this was spoken in wrath, we do not call wrath to mind at the beginning of the year. REMEMBRANCE VERSES, as for instance, And he remembered that they were flesh² etc. SHOFAR VERSES, as for instance, Blow ye the horn in Gibeah³ etc. If, however, he desires to recite kingship, remembrance and shofar verses mentioning the punishment of idolaters, he may do so. 'Kingship verses', as for instance, The Lord reigneth, let the peoples tremble,⁴ or, The Lord is king for ever and ever, the nations are perished out of his land.⁵

'Remembrance verses', as for instance, Remember, O Lord, against the children of Edom⁶ etc. 'Shofar verses', as for instance, And the Lord God will blow the horn and will go with whirlwinds of the south,⁷ and the text continues, The Lord of hosts will defend them.⁸ [On the other hand] a verse mentioning the remembrance of an individual is not recited, even if it is for good, as for instance, Remember me, O Lord, when thou favourest thy people,⁹ or, Remember unto to me, O my God, for good.¹⁰ 'Visitation' is equivalent to 'remembrance', as, for instance, in the verse, And the Lord visited Sarah,¹¹ or, I have surely visited you.¹² This is the view of R. Jose; R. Judah, however, says that 'visitation' is not equivalent to 'remembrance'. Now on R. Jose's view, even granting that 'visitation' is equivalent to 'remembrance', the text, 'And the Lord visited Sarah' refers to the visitation of an individual,¹³ [does it not]? — Since a multitude issued from her,¹⁴ it is as good as a multitude.

[In the text], Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, that the king of glory may come in. Who is the king of glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle, Lift up your heads, O ye gates, yea, lift them up, ye everlasting doors, that the king of glory may come in. Who is the king of glory? The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory,¹⁵ the first [apostrophe] contains two mentions [of God's kingship]¹⁶ and the second three. So R. Jose; R. Judah, however, says that the first contains one and the second two.¹⁷ [In the text], Sing praises to God, sing praises; sing praises unto our king, sing praises. For God is the king of all the earth,¹⁸ there are two mentions [of God's kingship]; so R. Jose. R. Judah, however, says there is only one.¹⁹ They agree, however, that in the verse, God reigneth over the nations, God sitteth upon his holy throne,²⁰ there is only one.

A remembrance verse which also mentions blowing [teru'ah], as for instance, a memorial proclaimed with the blast of horns, a holy convocation may be recited either with the remembrance verses or with the shofar verses; so R. Jose. R. Judah, however, says that it may be recited only with the remembrance verses.²¹ A kingship verse which also contains mention of blowing, as, for instance, The Lord his God is with him and the shouting [teru'ath] for the king is among them,²² may be recited either with the kingship verses or with the shofar verses; so R. Jose. R. Judah, however, says that it may be recited only with the kingship verses.²³ A verse mentioning simply blowing of the trumpet, as for instance, it is a day of blowing the horn [teru'ah] unto you,²⁴ may be recited with the shofar verses; so R. Jose. R. Judah, however, says that it may not be recited at all.²⁵

IT IS PROPER TO BEGIN WITH THE TORAH AND CONCLUDE WITH THE PROPHETS. R. JOSE SAID: IF ONE CONCLUDES WITH THE TORAH HE HAS FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION. 'IF ONE CONCLUDES' [HE HAS FULFILLED]: that is to say, the deed having been done; but he should not do so in the first instance. [Is this correct] seeing that it has been taught: 'R. Jose says, He who concludes with the Torah verses, he is to be commended'? — Read, 'He concludes'. But it states [distinctly], IF HE CONCLUDES [etc.], [which implies that] what is done is done, but in the first instance it should not be done? — What is meant is this: 'It is proper to commence with the Torah and conclude with the Prophets. R. Jose said: It is proper to conclude with the Torah, but if one concluded with the Prophets, he has fulfilled his obligation'. It has been taught to the same effect: 'R. Eleazar b. R. Jose said: The wethikin,²⁶ used to conclude with the Torah'.

We can understand this being done with the remembrance and shofar verses, because there are numbers of them [in the Pentateuch], but of kingship verses there are only three, viz., The Lord his God is with him and the shouting for the King is among them,²⁷ And he was king in Jeshurun,²⁸ and The Lord shall reign for ever and ever,²⁹ and we require ten verses [in all]³⁰ and [in this way] we cannot find them?³¹ — R. Huna replied: Come and hear. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is one;³² this is a kingship verse according to R. Jose, though R. Judah says it is not a kingship verse. And thou shalt know on that day and lay it to thy heart that the Lord he is God, there is none else,³³ is a kingship verse according to R. Jose, though R. Judah says it is not a kingship verse, Unto thee it

was shown, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him³⁴ is a kingship verse according to R. Jose, though R. Judah says it is not a kingship verse.

MISHNAH. OF THOSE WHO PASS BEFORE THE ARK³⁵ ON THE HOLYDAY OF NEW YEAR, THE SECOND³⁶ BLOWS³⁷ THE SHOFAR. ON DAYS WHEN HALLEL IS SAID,³⁸ THE FIRST³⁹ READS ALOUD THE HALLEL.⁴⁰

GEMARA. What special reason is there for the second to blow? [You must say], because of the maxim, In the multitude of people is the king's glory.⁴¹ But if that is so, Hallel should also be recited by the second because 'in the multitude of people is the king's glory'? Should you say, however, that there is a special reason why Hallel is said by the first, because the zealous come early for the performance of religious duties, then let the blowing of the shofar be performed by the first because the zealous come early for the performance of religious duties! — R. Johanan replied: They made this rule at a time when the Government had forbidden [the blowing of the shofar].⁴²

Since it says, ON DAYS WHEN HALLEL IS SAID, we infer that on New Year Hallel is not said. What is the reason? — R. Abbahu replied: The ministering angels said in the Presence of the Holy One, blessed be He: Sovereign of the Universe, why should Israel not chant hymns of praise before Thee on New Year and the Day of Atonement? He replied to them: Is it possible that the King should be sitting on the throne of justice with the books of life and death open before Him, and Israel should chant hymns of praise?

MISHNAH. [FOR THE SAKE OF] THE SHOFAR OF NEW YEAR IT IS NOT ALLOWED TO DISREGARD THE DISTANCE LIMIT⁴³ NOR TO REMOVE DEBRIS NOR TO CLIMB A TREE NOR TO RIDE ON AN ANIMAL NOR TO SWIM ON THE WATER. IT MUST NOT BE SHAPED⁴⁴ EITHER WITH AN IMPLEMENT THE USE OF WHICH IS FORBIDDEN ON ACCOUNT OF SHEBUTH⁴⁵ OR WITH ONE THE USE OF WHICH IS FORBIDDEN BY EXPRESS PROHIBITION.⁴⁶ IF ONE, HOWEVER, DESIRES TO POUR WINE OR WATER INTO IT HE MAY DO SO.⁴⁷ CHILDREN NEED NOT

BE STOPPED FROM BLOWING; ON THE CONTRARY, THEY MAY BE HELPED⁴⁸ TILL THEY LEARN HOW TO BLOW. ONE WHO BLOWS MERELY TO PRACTISE⁴⁹ DOES NOT THEREBY FULFIL HIS RELIGIOUS OBLIGATION, NOR DOES ONE WHO HEARS THE BLAST MADE BY ANOTHER WHEN PRACTISING.

GEMARA. What is the reason [why these things may not be done]? — The blowing of the shofar is [based on] a positive precept,⁵⁰ whereas the observance of the holyday is [based both on] a positive⁵¹ and a negative precept,⁵² and a positive precept cannot override both a positive and a negative precept.

NOR TO CLIMB A TREE NOR TO RIDE ON AN ANIMAL etc, Seeing that you have not allowed even Rabbinical [prohibitions to be broken],⁵³ need you mention Pentateuchal ones?⁵⁴ — The Mishnah adopts the style of 'A, and needless to say B'.

(1) Ezek. XX, 33.

(2) Ps. LXXVIII, 39.

(3) Hos. V, 8.

(4) Ps. XCIX, 1.

(5) Ps. X, 16.

(6) Ibid. CXXXVII, 7.

(7) Zech. IX, 14.

(8) Ibid. 15.

- (9) Ps. CVI, 4.
- (10) Neh. V, 19.
- (11) Gen. XXI, 1. Heb. פקד
- (12) Ex. III, 16.
- (13) Which has just been declared inadmissible.
- (14) Through this visitation.
- (15) Ps. XXIV, 7-10.
- (16) I.e., the expression 'the king of glory'.
- (17) R. Judah does not reckon the question 'who is the king of glory'.
- (18) Ps. XLVII, 7, 8.
- (19) R. Judah does not reckon 'Our King', as this does not declare God king over the whole world.
- (20) Ibid. 9.
- (21) Because the mention of teru'ah is not equivalent to the mention of shofar.
- (22) Num. XXIII, 21.
- (23) V. n. 1.
- (24) Num. XXIX, 1.
- (25) V. n. 1.
- (26) Lit., 'ancients': a name given to certain men of exceptional piety in the days of the Second Temple. [These are identified by some with the Essenes, v. J.E. V. p. 226. Others regard them as a community of priests who held a service in common; v. Blau, REJ, XXXI, pp. 184ff.]
- (27) Num. XXIII, 21.
- (28) Deut. XXXIII, 5.
- (29) Ex. XV, 18.
- (30) V. supra 32a.
- (31) As the Torah verses come last, they should be four out of the ten
- (32) Deut. VI, 4.
- (33) Ibid. IV, 39.
- (34) Ibid. 35.
- (35) Lit., 'he who passes etc.'. I.e., who read the service before the congregation. These were said to 'pass' or, more correctly, to 'go down before the Ark', because they stood in front of the Ark on a level lower than the Ark itself and the rest of the congregation.
- (36) I.e., the one who reads the Musaf service (v. Glos.).
- (37) מתקיע Hai Gaon takes it literally, 'he causes to blow', 'he orders the blowing'. I.e., he recites the prayers introductory to the blowing, v. supra 32a, but the blowing itself is performed by another to avoid confusing the reader; cf. Ber. 34a.]
- (38) Lit., 'at the time of Hallel': e.g., on the festivals.
- (39) I.e., the one who reads the shaharith service (v. Glos.).
- (40) V. Glos.
- (41) Prov. XIV, 28. The larger the congregation, the greater the honour paid to God. The implication is that there will be more persons present at the later than at the earlier service.
- (42) And the blowing was less likely to be noticed if it was postponed to the second half of the service. Once made the rule was not altered even when the reason for it had disappeared, v. supra p. 61, n. 5.
- (43) Lit., 'to pass the limit'. I.e., to travel more than the permitted two thousand cubits in order to hear the shofar blown.
- (44) Lit., 'cut'.
- (45) I.e., merely to make a distinction between Sabbath (or holydays) and weekdays, and not because any 'work' in the strict legal sense is involved. For shebuth, v. Glos.
- (46) Found in or based on the Pentateuch.
- (47) And we do not say that he is carrying out repairs, which is forbidden on the Sabbath or holydays.
- (48) Lit., 'we occupy ourselves with them'.
- (49) Lit., 'one who occupies himself'.
- (50) Num. XXIX, 1. It shall be a day of blowing the horn unto you.
- (51) Lev. XXIII, 24: In the seventh month . . . shall be a solemn rest unto you.

(52) Ibid. 25: Ye shall do no manner of servile work.

(53) The prohibitions to exceed the Sabbath limit and to remove debris are purely Rabbinical, without basis in the Pentateuch. (Rashi).

(54) Riding and climbing are forbidden because they might lead to the cutting or plucking of a branch, which is forbidden by the Pentateuch. The argument is very forced, and Rashi is inclined to regard the whole sentence as spurious. [R. Hananel takes the prohibitions regarding the Sabbath limit and removing the debris to be the Biblical prohibitions referred to.]

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 33a

IT MUST NOT BE SHAPED EITHER WITH AN IMPLEMENT THE USE OF WHICH IS FORBIDDEN ON ACCOUNT OF SHEBUTH OR WITH ONE THE USE OF WHICH IS FORBIDDEN BY EXPRESS PROHIBITION. 'An instrument the use of which is forbidden on account of shebuth' — as for instance, a sickle.¹ 'An implement which is forbidden by express prohibition' — as for instance, a knife. Seeing that you disallow an implement prohibited on account of shebuth, need you mention one disallowed by express prohibition?² — The Mishnah adopts the style of 'A and needless to say B'.

IF ONE, HOWEVER, DESIRES TO POUR WINE OR WATER INTO IT HE MAY DO SO. Wine or water he may, but urine he may not. Which authority does our Mishnah follow? — That of Abba Saul, as it has been taught: 'Abba Saul says, Wine or water is permissible, these serving to clean it, but urine is forbidden, as showing disrespect'.³

CHILDREN NEED NOT BE STOPPED FROM BLOWING. This would imply that women are stopped. [But how can this be], seeing that it has been taught: 'Neither children nor women need be stopped from blowing the shofar on the Festival'? — Abaye replied: There is no discrepancy; the one statement follows R. Judah, the other R. Jose and R. Simeon, as it has been taught: 'Speak unto the children [bene] of Israel:⁴ [this indicates that] the "sons" [bene] of Israel lay on hands but not the "daughters" of Israel. So R. Judah, R. Jose and R. Simeon say that women also have the option of laying on hands'.⁵

ON THE CONTRARY, THEY MAY BE HELPED UNTIL THEY LEARN HOW TO BLOW. R. Eleazar said: Even on Sabbath. it has been taught to the same effect: 'They may be helped till they learn how to blow even on Sabbath, and children are not stopped from blowing on Sabbath, and needless to say on a [weekday] holyday'. This statement itself involves a contradiction. You say first, 'They may be helped till they learn how to blow, even on Sabbath', from which I should infer that we may actually tell them in the first instance to blow. Then it states, 'They are not stopped', which would indicate that we do not go so far as to stop them, but we do not tell them in the first instance to blow! — There is no contradiction: In the one case we speak of

(1) To cut ordinary articles with a scythe or sickle on Sabbath is not regarded legally as 'work' because the implement is not being used for its proper purpose. The Rabbis, however, forbade it on account of shebuth.

(2) The sanction for which is Pentateuchal and not merely Rabbinical.

(3) Lit., 'because of respect'.

(4) Lev. I, 2, introducing the regulations of the sacrifice.

(5) Similarly R. Jose and R. Simeon hold that although women are not commanded to blow the shofar (this being a precept for which a definite time is fixed), they have the option of doing so, and therefore may practise.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 33b

a child old enough to be trained [in the performance of religious precepts],¹ in the other of one not yet old enough to be trained.

ONE WHO BLOWS MERELY TO PRACTISE DOES NOT THEREBY FULFIL HIS RELIGIOUS OBLIGATION:² I infer that one who blows to make musical sounds³ does thereby fulfil his religious obligation. May we say that this supports Raba, for Raba said that one who blows to make musical sounds fulfils his religious obligation?⁴ — Perhaps our authority includes ‘making music’ also under the head of ‘practising’.

NOR ONE WHO HEARS THE BLAST MADE BY ANOTHER WHEN PRACTISING. But one who hears the blast from another who is blowing for himself, we are to assume, does fulfil his obligation? If so, this would be a refutation of R. Zera; for R. Zera said to his attendant, ‘Blow with intent to clear me⁵ also’!⁶ — Perhaps our authority having mentioned ‘practising’ in the first clause used the same expression in the second.⁷

MISHNAH. THE ORDER OF THE BLASTS CONSISTS OF THREE SETS⁸ OF THREE EACH.⁹ THE LENGTH OF A TEKI'AH IS EQUAL TO THREE TERU'AHS,¹⁰ AND THE LENGTH OF A TERU'AH TO THREE YEBABOTH.¹¹ IF ONE BLEW THE FIRST TEKI'AH¹² [AS USUAL] AND PROLONGED THE SECOND SO AS TO MAKE IT EQUAL TO TWO, IT COUNTS ONLY AS ONE.¹³ IF ONE HAS SAID THE [NINE] BLESSINGS¹⁴ AND THEN PROCURES¹⁵ A SHOFAR, HE SOUNDS A TEKI'AH TERU'AH TEKI'AH THREE

prohibition, and therefore explains that it is the other one whom we may help, and this one we simply do not stop.

TIMES!¹⁶ JUST AS THE CONGREGATIONAL READER IS UNDER OBLIGATION, SO EVERY INDIVIDUAL IS UNDER OBLIGATION.¹⁷ RABBAN GAMALIEL, HOWEVER, SAID THAT THE CONGREGATIONAL READER CLEARS THE WHOLE CONGREGATION OF THEIR OBLIGATION.

GEMARA. [THE LENGTH OF THE TEKI'AH IS EQUAL TO THREE TERU'AHS]. But it has been taught that the length of a teki'ah is equal to a teru'ah? — Abaye replied: Our Tanna reckons the teki'ahs of all the sets and the teru'ahs of all the sets,¹⁸ whereas the external Tanna¹⁹ was reckoning one set and no more.²⁰

THE LENGTH OF THE TERU'AH IS EQUAL TO THE LENGTH OF THREE YEBABOTH. But it has been taught, ‘The length of the teru'ah is equal to three shebarim’?²¹ — Abaye said: Here there is really a difference of opinion. It is written, It shall be a day of teru'ah unto you,²² and we translate [in Aramaic], a day of yebaba, and it is written of the mother of Sisera, Through the window she looked forth,²³ [wa-teyabab]. One authority thought that this means drawing a long sigh,²⁴ and the other that it means uttering short piercing cries.

Our Rabbis taught: ‘Whence do we know [that the blowing on New Year must be] with a shofar? Because it says, Thou, shalt make proclamation, with a shofar of teru'ah.²⁵ I know this so far only of the Jubilee; how do I know it of New Year? The text says significantly, In the seventh month,²⁶ when there is no real occasion for the expression, in the seventh month.²⁷ Why then does it say, in the seventh month? To show that all the teru'ahs of the seventh month should be of the same character. How do we know that there must be a plain blast²⁸ before it? Because it says, Thou, shalt make proclamation with a shofar of teru'ah.²⁹ How do we know that there must be a plain blast³⁰ after it? Because it says, Ye shall make proclamation with the shofar.³¹ I know this only of the Jubilee; how do I learn it of New Year also? It says significantly, in the seventh month³²

(1) Such a one we may actually help to learn. So Rashi. Tosaf., however, (s.v. תניא) objects that this would involve telling him to break a Rabbinical

- (2) Even if accidentally he produces the proper sounds.
- (3) Without religious intention.
- (4) V. supra 28b.
- (5) From the obligation of blowing the shofar.
- (6) This would show that in R. Zera's opinion it was not sufficient to hear another blowing merely for himself.
- (7) But he meant to include one blowing for himself
- (8) One set for the kingship, one for the remembrance and one for the shofar verses, v. supra 32a.
- (9) A teki'ah, teru'ah and teki'ah in each set. For teki'ah and teru'ah v. Glos.
- (10) V. infra in the Gemara.
- (11) Lit., 'moanings'. The meaning of this word is discussed in the Gemara infra.
- (12) Of one set of three.
- (13) I.e., he cannot count half for one set and half for the next.
- (14) Of the Musaf prayer.
- (15) Lit., 'there was assigned to him'.
- (16) For each of the three sets, cf. p. 164, n. 7.
- (17) To say the daily prayers, v. Gemara.
- (18) And we should translate: 'the length of a teki'ah is the same as that of (each of) the three teru'ahs'.
- (19) The Tanna of the Baraitha or 'external' Mishnah.
- (20) And he meant just the same thing.
- (21) Lit., 'breakings'. These are somewhat longer than yebaboth.
- (22) Num. XXIX, 1.
- (23) Jud. V, 28. E.V. 'and peered'.
- (24) The one who held that a teru'ah is equal to three shebarim.
- (25) Lev. XXV, 9, referring to the Jubilee. E.V. 'blast of the horn'.
- (26) Ibid.
- (27) Because it says immediately after, 'on the day of atonement'.
- (28) I.e., a teki'ah.
- (29) Which is taken to mean 'shofar (i.e., teki'ah) and teru'ah'.
- (30) I.e., a teki'ah.
- (31) Lev. XXV, 9. The repetition of the word shofar points to another teki'ah.
- (32) Ibid.

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 34a

when there is no real occasion for the expression, "in the seventh month". Why then does it say, "in the seventh month"? To indicate that all the teru'ahs of the seventh month should be of the same character. How do we know that there must be three sets of three each? Because it says, Thou shalt make proclamation with the shofar of teru'ah,¹ and again, a solemn rest, a memorial of teru'ah,² and again, a day of teru'ah it shall be to you.³ And how do we know that we can utilize what is said in connection with one for purposes of the other and vice versa?⁴ The word "seventh" occurs twice⁵ to provide a gezerah shawah.⁶ How then is it carried out? There are three [sets] which are nine [blasts]. The length of the teki'ah is equal to that of the teru'ah. The length of the teru'ah is equal to three shebarim'.

This Tanna first derives his inference from an analogy⁷ and now he derives it from a gezerah shawah!⁸ — He reasons thus: 'If there were no gezerah shawah, I would derive the inference from analogy; now, however, that there is a gezerah shawah, I do not require the analogy'.

The following Tanna derives the same lesson from a gezerah shawah [with the blowing of the horn ordained] in the wilderness, as it has been taught: And ye shall blow a teru'ah:⁹ this indicates that there shall be a separate teki'ah¹⁰ and a separate teru'ah. You say, there shall be a separate teki'ah and a separate teru'ah! But can it not be interpreted differently, namely, that the teki'ah and teru'ah

are all one?¹¹ When you come to the text, But when the assembly is to be gathered together ye shall blow a teki'ah but not a teru'ah,¹² you must conclude that teki'ah and teru'ah are separate. And how do we know that a plain blast is to precede it [the teru'ah]? Because it says, And ye shall blow a teru'ah.' And how do we know that a plain blast follows it? Because it says, a teru'ah shall they blow.¹³ R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroka said: This¹⁴ is not necessary. For the text says, And ye shall blow a teru'ah a second time.¹⁵ Here the words a second time' are unnecessary.¹⁶ Why then are the words 'a second time' inserted? This furnishes a general rule¹⁷ that wherever teru'ah is mentioned a teki'ah should follow it.¹⁸ So far I know this only of the wilderness.¹⁹ On what ground can I apply it to New Year also? Because we find teru'ah [in one place] and teru'ah [in another place]²⁰ to provide a gezerah shawah. Three teru'ahs are mentioned in connection with New Year — 'a solemn rest, a memorial proclaimed with teru'ah'; 'a day of teru'ah', and 'thou shalt make proclamation with the shofar of teru'ah'. Each teru'ah is accompanied with two teki'ahs. We thus learn that three teru'ahs and six teki'ahs were prescribed for New Year. Two of these are ordained by the Torah and one by the Soferim:²¹ [The teru'ahs mentioned in] 'a solemn rest, a memorial of teru'ah,' and in 'thou shalt make proclamation with the shofar of teru'ah' are ordinances of the Torah; the text 'a day of teru'ah it shall be to you' is required for its own lesson.²² R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: One is ordained by the Torah and two by the Soferim: [That mentioned in] 'and thou shalt make proclamation with the shofar of teru'ah' is ordained by the Torah. [The texts] 'a solemn rest, a memorial of teru'ah' and, 'a day of teru'ah it shall be to you', are required for their own lessons. What is meant by saying that 'it [the latter] is required for its own lesson'?²³ — It is required to show that [the blowing must be] in the daytime and not at night. Whence does the other authority derive the rule that the blowing must be by day and not by night? — He derives it from the expression On the Day of Atonement.²⁴ But if he learns it from 'On the Day of Atonement', let him also learn from this text the rule that there is to be a plain blast before the teru'ah and a plain blast after it?²⁵ — He does not accept the implication of the expressions 'and thou shalt proclaim', 'ye shall proclaim'. How then does he expound these words? — [He expounds] 'and thou shalt proclaim' in the same way as R. Mattenah; for R. Mattenah said: 'And thou shalt proclaim': this means, in the usual manner of proclamation.²⁶ The words 'Ye shall proclaim' mentioned by the All-Merciful indicate that the shofar should be taken in the hand,²⁷ and the other, [what says he to this?] — The lesson of R. Mattenah you can learn from the fact that the text uses an unusual expression,²⁸ but that the word means 'taking in the hand' you could not maintain, for one can compare the expression 'passing' here with the expression 'passing' used in connection with Moses.²⁹ It is written here, And ye shall cause to pass a shofar of teru'ah, and it is written elsewhere, And Moses commanded, and they caused a voice to pass.³⁰ Just as there the passing was of a sound, so here it is of a sound.

And to the Tanna who derives the rule [regarding the teki'ah] from [the blowing commanded] in the wilderness, [it may be objected that] just as there trumpets were to be used, so here [on New Year] trumpets should be used? — Therefore it is written, Blow ye the shofar at the New Moon, at the concealment for the day of our festival.³¹ Which is the festival on which the moon is concealed? You must say that this is New Year; and the All-Merciful prescribed the shofar [to be used on it].

R. Abbahu prescribed in Caesarea that there should be a teki'ah, three shebarim, a teru'ah and a teki'ah. How can this be justified?³² If [the sound of teru'ah] is a kind of wailing, then there should be teki'ah, teru'ah³³ and teki'ah, and if it is a kind of groaning, there should be teki'ah, three shebarim, and teki'ah? — He was in doubt whether it was a kind of wailing or a kind of groaning.³⁴ R. 'Awira strongly demurred against this procedure, saying, Perhaps it is a kind of wailing, and the three shebarim make an interruption between the teru'ah and the [first] teki'ah? — We assume that he afterwards blows teki'ah, teru'ah, teki'ah. Rabina strongly demurred against this, saying, Perhaps it is a kind of sighing and the teru'ah makes an interruption between the shebarim and the [second] teki'ah? — We suppose that he afterwards blows teki'ah, shebarim, teki'ah. What then is the point of R. Abbahu's regulation?³⁵ If it is a groaning sound, it has already been made,³⁶ and if it is a wailing

sound it has already been made?³⁷ — He was in doubt whether it does not include both groaning and wailing. If so, the reverse should also be carried out, namely, teki'ah, teru'ah, three shebarim, teki'ah, since perhaps it is wailing and groaning? — Ordinarily when a man has a pain, he first groans and then wails.

IF ONE BLEW THE FIRST TEKI'AH AND PROLONGED THE SECOND SO AS TO MAKE IT EQUAL TO TWO. R. Johanan said: If one heard

-
- (1) Lev. XXV, 9, referring to the Jubilee. E.V. 'blast of the horn',
 - (2) Ibid. XXIII, 24.
 - (3) Num. XXIX, 1.
 - (4) Two of the verses quoted occur in connection with the New Year and one in connection with the Jubilee. What right have we then to assume from this that there should be three teru'ahs on each?
 - (5) In the seventh month (Lev. XXIII, 24) in connection with New Year, and in the seventh month (Lev. XXV, 9) in connection with the Jubilee.
 - (6) V. Glos.
 - (7) On the basis of the superfluous 'in the seventh month'.
 - (8) Heb. hekkesh. Having laid down from analogy the principle that all the teru'ahs of the seventh month must be of the same character, why does he require a gezerah shawah to show that there must be three both on New Year and on the Jubilee?
 - (9) Num. X, 5. E.V. 'And when ye blow an alarm'.
 - (10) The word **ותקעתם** being taken to signify the blowing of a teki'ah.
 - (11) I.e., made in one blast. And the word **ותקעתם** means simply 'and you shall blow'.
 - (12) Ibid. 7' E.V. 'ye shall blow but ye shall not sound an alarm'.
 - (13) Ibid. 6.
 - (14) I.e., to resort to so forced an exposition.
 - (15) Ibid. 6.
 - (16) Because one blowing of an alarm has already been mentioned in v. 5'
 - (17) Lit., 'builds a father'.
 - (18) And we translate, 'and ye shall blow a teki'ah' as second to the teru'ah'.
 - (19) I.e., of the assembling of the people in the wilderness.
 - (20) Viz., in connection both with the wilderness and the New Year.
 - (21) V. Glos.
 - (22) I.e., to provide a gezerah shawah; and the third teru'ah is an ordinance of the Soferim.
 - (23) The gezerah shawah being provided by the other text.
 - (24) Lev. XXV, 9.
 - (25) . From the texts, 'and thou shalt make proclamation', 'and ye shall make proclamation', as supra 33b ad fin.
 - (26) I.e., the shofar must not be held the wrong way up, v. supra 27b.
 - (27) And not blown.
 - (28) The word **והעברת** lit., 'and ye shall cause to pass' instead of 'you shall blow'.
 - (29) [This is apparently the meaning of this difficult passage].
 - (30) Ex. XXXVI, 6.
 - (31) Ps. LXXXI, 4. E.V. 'at the full moon for our feast day, v. supra 8a.
 - (32) Lit., 'what is your desire?', a formula for posing a dilemma.
 - (33) I.e., what is elsewhere called yebaba.
 - (34) And had both sounds blown.
 - (35) If he repeats both teki'ah, teru'ah, teki'ah, and teki'ah, shebarim, teru'ah.
 - (36) In teki'ah, teru'ah, teki'ah. [MS.M.: We are making it.]
 - (37) In teki'ah, shebarim, teki'ah. We then have a set containing four blasts.

nine blasts at nine different times of the day, he has performed his religious obligation. It has been taught to the same effect: 'If one heard nine blasts at nine different times of the day, he has performed his religious obligation. If, however, he heard nine different people at once, he has not performed his obligation.¹ If he hears a teki'ah from one and a teru'ah from another, he has fulfilled his obligation, even if the intervals extended over the whole day'.

But could R. Johanan have said this,² seeing that R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadok: If in the midst of reciting Hallel and the Megillah³ one paused long enough to say the whole, he must go back to the beginning? — There is no contradiction: in one case he was giving his own opinion, in the other that of his teacher. But does not his own opinion [conflict with the above statement]? Was not R. Abbahu once following after R. Johanan reciting the shema',³ and when he came to some dirty alley-ways he stopped, and after they had passed them he asked R. Johanan whether he should finish, and he replied, If you paused long enough to say the whole, you must start again from the beginning? What he meant to say to him was this: 'I do not hold this view,⁴ but according to you who do hold it,⁵ if you have paused long enough to say the whole, you must start afresh'.

Our Rabbis taught: '[On most days]⁶ the omission of one blast is no bar to another, and the omission of one blessing⁷ is no bar to another, but on New Year and the Day of Atonement the omission of one blast or one blessing is a bar to the others'.⁸ What is the reason? — Rabbah said: God proclaimed: Recite before Me on New Year kingship, remembrance and shofar verses; kingship verses to declare Me king over you; remembrance verses, that the remembrance of you may come before Me for good; and through what? Through the shofar.

IF ONE HAS SAID THE [NINE] BLESSINGS AND THEN PROCURES A SHOFAR, HE SOUNDS A TEKI'AH, TERU'AH, TEKI'AH. The reason is that he had no shofar to begin with. This shows that if he had a shofar to begin with, when he hears the blasts he must hear them during the recital of the blessings.⁹ R. Papa b. Samuel rose to say his prayer, and at the same time said to his attendant, When I give you a sign,¹⁰ blow the shofar for me. Said Raba to him:¹¹ This rule¹² was laid down only for a congregation.¹³ It has been taught to the same effect: 'When he hears the blasts, he must hear them in order, and during the recital of the blessings.¹⁴ When does this hold good? In a congregation; but when not praying with the congregation he must hear them in order but not necessarily during the recital of the blessings. If an individual has not blown [the shofar], another may blow it for him, but if an individual has not said the blessings another may not say them for him. It is a greater act of piety to hear the shofar than to say the blessings. Hence¹⁵ if there are two towns in one of which the shofar is being blown and in the other of which the blessings are being said, one should go rather to the place where they are blowing than to the place where they are saying the blessings'. Surely this is self-evident: the former precept is of Pentateuchal sanction, the latter [only] of Rabbinic! — It was necessary to state the rule, [to show that it still applies] even though he is certain of [finding an opportunity for] the latter and not certain of [finding an opportunity for] the former.¹⁶

JUST AS THE CONGREGATIONAL READER IS UNDER OBLIGATION, SO EVERY INDIVIDUAL etc. It has been taught: 'They said to Rabban Gamaliel: Accepting your view,¹⁷ why do the congregation [first] say the ['Amidah] prayer? He replied, So as to give the reader time to prepare his prayer.¹⁸ Rabban Gamaliel then said to them: Accepting your view,¹⁹ why does the reader go down [and stand] before the Ark?²⁰ They replied: So as to clear from his obligation one who is not familiar [with the prayers]. He said to them: Just as he clears one who is not familiar, so he clears one who is familiar'.²¹

Rabbah b. bar Hanah said in the name of R. Johanan: The Sages gave Rabban Gamaliel right. Rab, however, said: The difference of opinion still remains.²² Hiyya the son of Rabbah b. Nahmani heard

the argument [reported] and went and repeated it before R. Dimi b. Hinnena. He said to him: Thus said Rab: The difference of opinion still remains. The other said to him: This is what Rabbah b. bar Hanah also said, that when R. Johanan made this statement, Resh Lakish joined issue with him, saying: The difference of opinion still remains. But did R. Johanan say this? Has not R. Hanah of Sepphoris stated that R. Johanan said that the law²³ follows the view of Rabban Gamaliel, and since he said the law is so, we infer that there is a difference of opinion?

- (1) According to Tosaf. the reason is because he does not hear a teru'ah preceded and followed by a teki'ah. Rashi, however, reads: 'If he heard nine people at once, a teki'ah from one and a teru'ah from another, he has fulfilled his obligation, and even if he heard at intervals' etc. He points out that it has already been laid down above that two different sounds from two different persons can be discerned at once.
- (2) That it is permissible to hear different blasts at different times.
- (3) V. Glos.
- (4) That it is necessary to pause on coming to a dirty place, (V. Ber. 24b) nor, again, that it is necessary to start afresh after a pause.
- (5) And your difficulty is simply, how long the pause must be.
- (6) E.g., on fast days.
- (7) In the 'Amidah. (V. Glos.).
- (8) I.e., a teru'ah cannot be blown without a teki'ah before it, nor can remembrance verses be said unless kingship verses have first been said. V. Tosaf. 33b, s.v. שיעור sub fin.
- (9) V. supra 32a.
- (10) As a signal that I have finished a blessing which is to be followed by the blowing of the shofar.
- (11) To reassure him.
- (12) That the blasts must be heard during the recital of the blessings.
- (13) חבר עיר v. Meg. Sonc. ed., p. 164, n. 1.
- (14) Lit., 'on the order of the blessings'.
- (15) Lit., 'how so?'.
- (16) He can always find ten men to make a congregation, but he may come too late to hear the shofar.
- (17) That the reader may recite on behalf of the congregation.
- (18) I. e. , put himself in the proper frame of mind by thinking over the prayers, which in those days were recited from memory.
- (19) That each individual must pray for himself.
- (20) V. supra p. 160, n. 9.
- (21) If he has accidentally omitted something. V. Tosaf. s.v. כך
- (22) [This sentence is rightly omitted in MS.M.]
- (23) [הלכה read with MS.M. הלכתא.]

Talmud - Mas. Rosh HaShana 35a

. When R. Ammi returned from a sea-voyage,¹ he explained it thus: 'The Sages give Rabban Gamaliel right' in regard to the blessings of New Year and the Day of Atonement; and 'the halachah is so', which implies that they differ in regard to the blessings of the rest of the year.² But is this so? Did not R. Hanah of Sepphoris say in the name of R. Johanan, 'The halachah follows Rabban Gamaliel in regard to the blessings of New Year and the Day of

Atonement'³ — No, said R. Nahman b. Isaac. Who is it that gave [Rabban Gamaliel] right? R. Meir;⁴ and the halachah is so', which shows that the Rabbis⁵ refer to [the others]. For it has been taught: 'In regard to the blessings of New Year and the Day of Atonement, the reader can clear the congregation of their obligation to say them'.

Why should a difference be made in respect of these [blessings]? Should you say it is because they contain many scriptural texts, has not R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, As soon as one has

said, 'And in thy Law it is written saying',⁶ he need not recite any more [texts]? — No; the reason is because there is an extra large number of blessings.⁷

[To revert to] the [above] text — R. Hananel said in the name of Rab, As soon as one has said, "And in thy Law it is written saying", he need not recite any more [texts]'. It was presumed [in the Academy] that this applies only to an individual but not to a congregation. It has been stated, however, [elsewhere]: R. Joshua b. Levi said: [The rule] alike for an individual or a congregation is that as soon as they have said 'And in thy Law it is written saying', they need not recite any more [texts].

R. Eleazar said: A man should always first prepare himself for his prayer⁸ and then say it. R. Abba said: The dictum of R.

Eleazar appears to be well founded in respect of the blessings of New Year and the Day of Atonement and periodical [prayers]⁹ but not of the rest of the year. Is that so? Did not Rab Judah use always to prepare himself for his prayer before praying? — Rab Judah was exceptional; since he prayed only every thirty days,¹⁰ it was [to him] like a periodical [prayer].

R. Aha b. 'Awira said in the name of R. Simeon the Pious: Rabban Gamaliel used to allow even the people in the fields to be cleared [by the reader in the synagogue], and needless to say those in town.¹¹ On the contrary, [we should have expected the opposite, because] the former are prevented from coming and the latter are not prevented, in the same way as Abba the son of R. Benjamin b. Hiyya has stated, 'The People who stand behind the priests are not included in the [priestly] benediction'! — The fact is that when Rabin came [from Palestine] he stated in the name of R. Jacob b. Idi that R. Simeon the Pious said: Rabban Gamaliel allowed only the people in the fields to be cleared [by the reader]. What is the reason? Because they are prevented by their work from coming [to synagogue]. Those in the town, however, are not cleared.¹²

(1) [**בְּיַמֵּי** Aliter: From Jammi, a place in Naftali.]

(2) And thus both statements of R. Johanan might be correct.

(3) Which shows that even on this point the Sages continued to differ with him.

(4) Who agrees with him in regard to the blessings of New Year and the Day of Atonement, and not the Sages, as at first stated in the name of R. Johanan.

(5) Apart from R. Meir.

(6) I.e., the passage which runs in our prayer-book, 'May we offer before thee the additional offerings of this day according to the commandment of thy will as thou hast prescribed for us in thy law'.

(7) Viz., nine instead of seven. [In point of fact the blessings on the Day of Atonement are only seven. [In point of fact the blessings on the Day of Atonement 'blessings' (v. Lewin, Otzar ha-Geonim, Rosh Hashanah p. 73; on this reading render: they (the benedictions) are lengthy. Ritba (a.l.) takes the Day of Atonement throughout this passage to refer to the Day of Atonement on the year of Jubilee, v. supra 33b].

(8) So as to be fluent and avoid all mistakes, v. supra p. 172, n. 2.

(9) For feasts, fasts, etc.

(10) Being occupied in the intervening period with study.

(11) Lit., 'those who are here'.

(12) [Rashi: They themselves must say the prayer and not rely on the reader. Alfasi: They are not cleared by the reader unless they attend the synagogue and hear from him the prayers from beginning to end; v. Commentary of R. Nissim a.l.]