

Sounding the shofar on Shabbat – תקיעה בשבת – The Gemara here concludes that this prohibition is due to Rabba's decree. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is indicated that the main prohibition is derived from the verses, as by Torah law the *shofar* should not be sounded outside the Temple on Shabbat, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Levi. It is further stated in the name of Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai that there is support for this opinion from the verse: "And you shall bring an offering made by fire to the Lord" (Leviticus 23:25), which appears after the mention of the *shofar*. It can be inferred from here that the sounding of the *shofar* is obligatory only in the place where offerings are sacrificed. It is further suggested in the Jerusalem Talmud that the *shofar* is sounded only when it is clearly "In the seventh month, on the first day of the month" (Leviticus 23:24), and this applies solely in the location of the Great Sanhedrin, which determines the calendar.

A temporary court – בני דיןא דאקראי – The commentaries dispute the definition of a temporary court in this context. Some maintain that everyone agrees that the *shofar* is sounded only in the Great Sanhedrin. However, according to the first *tanna*, even if the Great Sanhedrin moved to a temporary location they may still sound the *shofar* there (Ritva). Others explain that in any important court, even if it is not the Great Sanhedrin or even a court of twenty-three, they sound the *shofar*. This is apparently the opinion of the Rif, as they sounded the *shofar* in his court on Shabbat (see Ran).

אמר להם: נתקע ואחר כך נדון.
לאחר שתקעו אמרו לו: נדון! אמר
להם: כבר נשמעה קרן ביבנה, ואין
משיבין לאחר מעשה:

He said to them: First let us sound it, and afterward, when there is time, let us discuss the matter. After they sounded the *shofar*, the sons of Beteira said to Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai: Let us now discuss the issue. He said to them: The horn has already been heard in Yavne, and one does not refute a ruling after action has already been taken.^N There is no point in discussing the matter, as it would be inappropriate to say that the community acted erroneously after the fact.

אמר רבי אלעזר: לא התקין רבן יוחנן
בן זכאי אלא ביבנה בלבד. אמרו לו:
אחד יבנה ואחד כל מקום שיש בו
בית דין. אמרו לו היינו תנא קמא!

§ The mishna further stated that **Rabbi Elazar said: Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai instituted this practice only in Yavne. They said to him:** He instituted the practice both in Yavne and in any place where there is a court. The Gemara asks: This last statement of the Rabbis: **They said to him, etc.;** is the same as the opinion of the first *tanna* of the mishna. Why did the mishna repeat this opinion?

איכא ביניהו בי דיןא דאקראי

The Gemara answers: The practical difference between the opinion of the first *tanna* and the opinion of the Rabbis who issued that last statement is with regard to a **temporary court**,^N i.e., one that is not fixed in a certain place. According to the opinion of the first *tanna*, the *shofar* is sounded there as well, whereas according to the opinion of the Rabbis who responded to Rabbi Elazar, the *shofar* is sounded only in a place where there is a permanent court, similar to that in Yavne.

אמרו לו: אחד יבנה ואחד כל מקום
שיש בו בית דין. אמר רב הונא:

§ The mishna taught that **they said to him:** He instituted the practice both in Yavne and in any place where there is a court. **Rav Huna said:**

In the presence of the court – בפני בית דין – Some commentaries explain the reason for this clause as follows: Since the prohibition against sounding the *shofar* on Shabbat is due to a concern lest one violate Shabbat by performing a prohibited labor, the Sages were not worried about this possibility when the *shofar* was sounded in the presence of a court in session, as the court will ensure that no one carries his *shofar* there through a public domain (Rambam). Others add that once the court is out of session people are less in awe of their authority, and therefore the concern that one may carry a *shofar* is more relevant (*Meiri*).

When the prayer leader completed – בני מסיים שליחא – **דיציבורא**: Some commentaries maintain that one may sound a *shofar* only if it is required at least by rabbinic law (*Tosafot*). This incident in Yavne is cited as the basis for the custom, nowadays prevalent amongst the entire Jewish people, to sound another round of blasts after the prayers (*ge'onim*). Some communities even sound one hundred blasts, in accordance with the opinion of the *Shenei Luhot HaBerit*.

Sounding the shofar on Shabbat – תקיעה בשבת: When Rosh HaShana occurred on Shabbat they would sound the *shofar* only in the place of the court, in the presence of the court, while it was in session (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shofar* 2:9).

Perek IV

Daf 30 Amud a

ועם בית דין. מאי 'ועם בית דין?
בפני בית דין, לאפוקי שלא בפני
בית דין – דלא.

And they would sound the *shofar* on Shabbat^H with the court. Rav Huna's brief statement is obscure, and therefore the Gemara asks: **What is the meaning of the phrase: With the court?** It means: **In the presence of the court**,^N i.e., in the place where the court convenes. This comes to exclude any place that is not in the presence of the court, as the *shofar* is not sounded there.

מתיר רבא: ועוד זאת היתה ירושלים
יתירה על יבנה וכו'. מאי 'ועוד זאת?
אילימא כדקתני – 'זאת' מיבעי
ליה! אלא: דבירושלים תוקעין יחידין
וביבנה אין תוקעין יחידין.

§ Rava raised an objection from the mishna: **And Jerusalem had this additional superiority over Yavne. What is the meaning of the phrase: And this additional?** If we say that it is referring only to that which it teaches in the mishna, it should have simply said: This, without mentioning that it is an additional superiority. Rather, it indicates that in Jerusalem even private individuals sound the *shofar* on Shabbat, whereas in Yavne individuals do not sound it, but only agents of the court.

וביבנה אין תוקעין יחידין? והא
כי אתא רב יצחק בר יוסף אמר:
כי מסיים שליחא דיציבורא תקיעה
ביבנה – לא שמע איניש קל אוניה
מקל תקועיא דיחידא!

And this too is difficult: **Don't individuals sound the shofar in Yavne? But when Rav Yitzhak bar Yosef came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said:** When the prayer leader completed^N the sounding of the *shofar* in Yavne, nobody could hear the sound of his own voice in his ears due to the noise of the sounding of individuals. After the leader of the congregation finished sounding on behalf of the entire community, many individuals would take out their *shofars* and blast them, which created a loud noise. This indicates that individuals would sound the *shofar* on Shabbat even in Yavne.

Sounding the shofar in the Jubilee Year – תקיעה – It is a positive mitzva to sound the shofar on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year. Each and every individual is obligated to sound it (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 10:10).

The time of the sounding of the shofar in the Jubilee Year – זמן התקיעה ביוֹבֵל – In the Jubilee Year one may sound the shofar even away from the presence of the court. However, it must be at a time when the court is in session, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 10:11).

A positive, time-bound mitzva – מצות עשה שהזמן גרמא – Women are exempt from most positive, time-bound mitzvot. However, they are obligated to recite kiddush, eat matza on Passover, eat and slaughter the Paschal offering, attend the Assembly once every seven years in the Temple courtyard, and rejoice on the Festivals. In each of these cases the obligation of women is derived from a verse (Rambam *Sefer HaMadda, Hilkhot Avoda Zara* 12:3).

A woman is exempt from sounding the shofar – אשה פטורה מתקיעה – Women are exempt from sounding the shofar, although they are permitted to sound it for themselves and to recite the blessing (*Ateret Zahav*). One who has already fulfilled his obligation to sound the shofar is permitted to sound it for women, and even to carry the shofar to the public domain for this purpose (*Shulhan Arukh HaRav*). However, one who sounds the shofar exclusively for women is not permitted to recite the blessing for them (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 589:3, and in the comment of Rema).

אֵלָא לָאוּ – דְּבִירוּשָׁלַיִם תּוֹקְעִין בֵּין בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין וּבִיבְנָה, בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – אִין, שְׁלָא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – לָא. הָא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – מִהָא תּוֹקְעִין, וְאִפִּילוּ שְׁלָא בְּפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין?

לָא, דְּאִילוּ בִירוּשָׁלַיִם – תּוֹקְעִין בֵּין בְּפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין בֵּין שְׁלָא בְּפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין, וּבִיבְנָה, בְּפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין – אִין, שְׁלָא בְּפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין – לָא.

אִיכָא דְמַתְנֵי לְהָא דְרַב הוֹנָא אָהָא, דְכָתִיב: "בַּיּוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים תַּעֲבִירוּ שׁוֹפָר בְּכָל אֶרְצְכֶם" – מִלְּמֹד שְׁכָל יַחֲדִיד וְיַחֲדִיד חַיִּיב לְתַקְוָע. אָמַר רַב הוֹנָא: וְעַם בֵּית דִּין, מֵאִי וְעַם בֵּית דִּין? בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין, לְאִפּוּקֵי שְׁלָא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין, דְּלָא.

מְתִיב רַבָּא: תְּקִיעַת רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה וַיּוֹבֵל דּוֹחָה אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת בְּגּוֹלֵין, אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ. מֵאִי "אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ"? אִילִימָא אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ – אִיתְתָּא מִי מִיחִיבָא? וְהָא מְצוֹת עֲשֵׂה שְׁהַזְמַן גְּרָמָא הִיא, וְכָל מְצוֹת עֲשֵׂה שְׁהַזְמַן גְּרָמָא – נְשִׁים פְּטוּרוֹת!

אֵלָא לָאוּ: אִישׁ בְּבֵיתוֹ, וְאִפִּילוּ שְׁלָא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין? לָא, לְעוֹלָם בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין.

מְתִיב רַב שֶׁשֶׁת: שׁוּה יוֹבֵל לְרֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה לְתַקִּיעָה וְלְבִרְכוּת, אֵלָא שְׁבִיבֵל תּוֹקְעִין בֵּין בְּבֵית דִּין שְׁקִידְשׁוּ בּוֹ אֶת הַחֹדֶשׁ, וּבֵין בְּבֵית דִּין שְׁלָא קִידְשׁוּ בּוֹ אֶת הַחֹדֶשׁ, וְכָל יַחֲדִיד וְיַחֲדִיד חַיִּיב לְתַקְוָע. בְּרֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה לָא הֵיוּ תּוֹקְעִין אֵלָא בְּבֵית דִּין שְׁקִידְשׁוּ בּוֹ אֶת הַחֹדֶשׁ, וְאִין כָּל יַחֲדִיד וְיַחֲדִיד חַיִּיב לְתַקְוָע.

מֵאִי "אִין כָּל יַחֲדִיד וְיַחֲדִיד חַיִּיב לְתַקְוָע"? אִילִימָא דְבִיבֵל תּוֹקְעִין יַחֲדִין וּבְרֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה אִין תּוֹקְעִין יַחֲדִין – וְהָא כִּי אִתָּא רַב יִצְחָק בְּרִי יוֹסֵף אָמַר: כִּי הָיָה מְסִיִּים שְׁלִיחָא דְצִיבוּרָא תְּקִיעַתָּא בְּיַבְנָה לָא שְׁמַע אִינְשֵׁי קָל אִוְנִיה מְקַל תְּקוּעִיָּא דִּיחֲדָאִי!

Rather, is it not the case that in Jerusalem they sound the shofar both when the court was in session, i.e., until midday, and when the court was not in session. And by contrast, in Yavne, when the court was in session, yes, they would sound the shofar, whereas when the court was not in session, no, they would not sound it. If so, this indicates that when the court was in session they would in any case sound the shofar in Yavne, even though this was not in the presence of the court. This contradicts Rav Huna's opinion that in Yavne they would sound the shofar only in the presence of the court.

The Gemara rejects this argument. No, the term additional can be explained to mean that whereas in Jerusalem they would sound the shofar on Shabbat both in the presence of the court and not in the presence of the court, with regard to Yavne, in the presence of the court, yes, they would indeed sound it, but if it was not in the presence of the court, no, they would not sound the shofar.

Some teach this statement of Rav Huna not with regard to this mishna, but rather with regard to this baraita that deals with the Jubilee Year. As it is written: "On Yom Kippur you shall proclaim with the shofar throughout all your land" (Leviticus 25:9). This teaches that each and every individual is obligated to sound the shofar.¹⁴ In this connection Rav Huna said: And they sound it with the court. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: With the court? The Gemara explains: When the court is in session.¹⁵ This serves to exclude a case when the court is not in session, that the shofar is not sounded.

Rava raised an objection from a baraita: The sounding of the shofar on Rosh HaShana and on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year overrides the prohibitions of Shabbat even in the outlying areas outside the Temple, every man and his house. The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the phrase: Every man and his house? If we say that it means, as usual: Every man and his wife, is a woman obligated to sound the shofar? Isn't sounding the shofar a positive, time-bound mitzva, i.e., one that can be performed only at a certain time of the day, or during the day rather than during the night, or only on certain days of the year? And the principle is that with regard to any positive, time-bound mitzva,¹⁶ women are exempt.¹⁷

Rather, is it not the case that this phrase means: Every man in his house, and even at a time when the court is not in session? This presents a difficulty for the opinion of Rav Huna. The Gemara rejects this interpretation: No; actually it means that every man may sound the shofar in his house, but only at a time when the court is in session.

Rav Sheshet raised an objection from another baraita: Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year is the same as Rosh HaShana with regard to both the shofar sounding and the additional blessings recited in the Amidah prayer. However, the difference is that on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year they sound the shofar both in the court where they sanctified the month and in a court where they did not sanctify the month, and each and every individual is obligated to sound the shofar. Conversely, on Rosh HaShana they sound the shofar only in the court where they sanctified the month, and each and every individual is not obligated to sound it.

The Gemara asks: What is the meaning of the clause: Each and every individual is not obligated to sound it? If we say that on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year individuals sound the shofar, whereas on Rosh HaShana individuals do not sound it at all, this is difficult: But when Rav Yitzhak bar Yosef came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said: When the prayer leader completed the sounding of the shofar in Yavne, nobody could hear the sound of his own voice in his ears due to the noise of the sounding of individuals. This indicates that individuals would sound the shofar even on Rosh HaShana.

אין תוקעין – when the court is sitting – They sound only when the court is sitting – אין תוקעין – Rashi explains that all of these statements refer only to the Jubilee Year. However most other commentaries maintain that the reference is to Rosh HaShana (see *Penei Yehoshua*).

רואה פֿרט – See, to exclude a city that sits in a valley, etc. – רואה פֿרט: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that all of these criteria must be met for that city to sound the *shofar* (see Rashba). According to the Gemara there, the term: Hears, comes to exclude a case where Jerusalem can be seen from another city located at a much lower elevation. The term: Sees, excludes a case where a mountain divides between the two places.

אָלאַ לאַו: דאָילו בַּיובֿל – תוקעין בין בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין בֵּין שְׁלֵא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין, וּבְרֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – אין, שְׁלֵא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – לֹא. קִתְּנֵי מִיְהִתּ: בַּיובֿל, בֵּין בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין בֵּין שְׁלֵא בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין!

Rather, is it not the case that whereas on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year they sound the *shofar* both when the court is in session and when the court is not in session, on Rosh HaShana, when the court was in session, yes, they would indeed sound it, but at a time when the court was not in session, no, they would not sound the *shofar*. In any event, the *baraita* is teaching that on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year they would sound the *shofar* both when the court was in session and when the court was not in session. This presents a difficulty for the opinion of Rav Huna.

לֹא, לְעוֹלָם בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין, וְהָכִי קִתְּנֵי: בַּיובֿל, בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין – תוקעין בין בפני בית דין בין שלא בפני בית דין. בראש השנה תוקעין בּוֹמֵן בֵּית דִּין, וּבְפִנֵּי בֵּית דִּין. אֵיתָמַר נָמִי, אָמַר רַבִּי חֵיִיאָ בַּר גַּמְדָּא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בֶן שְׂאוּל אָמַר רַבִּי: אֵין תוקעין אָלאַ כָּל זְמַן שְׁבִיבֵית דִּין יוֹשְׁבֵין.

The Gemara rejects this argument. No; actually they sound the *shofar* only when the court was in session, and this is what the *baraita* is teaching: On Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year, when the court was in session they sound the *shofar* both in the presence of the court and not in the presence of the court; however, on Rosh HaShana they sound it only when the court was in session, and even then only in the presence of the court. It was also stated that Rabbi Hiyya bar Gamda said that Rabbi Yosei ben Shaul said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: They sound the *shofar* only throughout the period when the court is sittingⁿ in session, and only in its presence.

בְּעֵי רַבִּי זֵירָא: נִנְעָרוּ לְעֵמוּד וְלֹא עָמְדוּ, מַהוּ? בֵּית דִּין יוֹשְׁבֵין בְּעֵינֵן – וְהָאֵ אֵיבָא, אִו דְּלָמָּא זְמַן בֵּית דִּין בְּעֵינֵן – וְלֵיבָא? תִּיקוּ.

Rabbi Zeira raised a dilemma: If the members of the court stirred themselves to riseⁿ at the end of the session, but there was some delay and they did not actually rise, what is the *halakha*? Do we require that the court be seated, and that is the case here, as the judges are still sitting? Or perhaps we require that the *shofar* must be sounded when the court is in session, and that is not the case, as they have stirred to rise. No relevant sources were found in this regard, and therefore the Gemara states that the question shall stand unresolved.

”וְעוֹד זֹאת הֵיָתֵה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם? תִּירָה עַל יַבְנָה” וכו'. רואה – פֿרט לְיוֹשְׁבֵת בְּנַחֲלֵי.

§ The mishna stated: And Jerusalem had this additional superiority over Yavne. Any city that could see Jerusalem and hear the sounding of the *shofar* there, and was nearby, and people could come from there, they would sound the *shofar* there as well. The Gemara clarifies these requirements: The clause that the city had to be able to see Jerusalem comes to exclude a city that sits in a deep valley,ⁿ from which one can hear but cannot see Jerusalem from afar.

שׁוֹמֵעַת – פֿרט לְיוֹשְׁבֵת בְּרֵאשׁ הַהָר; קְרוּבָה – פֿרט לְיוֹשְׁבֵת חוּץ לְתַחוּם; וּיְכוּלָה לָבוֹא – פֿרט לְמַפְסֵיק לָהּ נִהְרָא.

When the mishna states that the city must be able to hear, this serves to exclude a city sitting on a mountaintop, from where one can see Jerusalem but cannot hear sounds from it. As for the requirement that the city must be near, this comes to exclude a place sitting beyond the Shabbat limit of Jerusalem, even if one can see and hear from that place. And with regard to the statement that one can come, this serves to exclude a city that is separated from Jerusalem by a river, which renders it impossible for people to come to the city, even if it is close by.

מִתְנִי' בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה הֵיָה הַלּוּלָב נִשְׁטַל בְּמִקְדָּשׁ שְׁבַעַה וּבְמִדְיָנָה יוֹם אֶחָד. מִשְׁתַּחֲרַב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הִתְקַיֵּן רַבֵּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַכַּי שִׁיָּהָא לּוּלָב נִשְׁטַל בְּמִדְיָנָה שְׁבַעַה, וְכֹר לְמִקְדָּשׁ,

MISHNA After the previous mishna mentioned Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai's ordinance that applies to the sounding of the *shofar*, this mishna records other ordinances instituted by the same Sage: At first, during the Temple era, the *lulav* was taken in the Temple all seven days of *Sukkot*, and in the rest of the country outside the Temple, it was taken only one day, on the first day of the Festival. After the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai instituted that the *lulav* should be taken even in the rest of the country all seven days,ⁿ in commemoration of the Temple.

HALAKHA

The court stirred to rise – נִנְעָרוּ בֵּית דִּין לְעֵמוּד: When they would sound the *shofar* on Rosh HaShana on Shabbat in the presence of the court, even if the court stirred to rise, others are permitted to sound their *shofar*, provided that the judges are still present. The reason is that this question was left unresolved by the Gemara, and one is lenient in uncertain cases involving

rabbinic law (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shofar* 2:9, and *Maggid Mishne* there).

The mitzva of *lulav* – מִצְוַת לּוּלָב: By Torah law the *lulav* is taken in all places only on the first day of the Festival, even if it occurred on Shabbat, while in the Temple it is taken for seven

days. However, when the Temple was destroyed the Sages instituted that it must be taken everywhere all seven days, with a blessing. Nevertheless, one does not take the *lulav* on Shabbat, even on the first day of the Festival (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shofar VeSukka VeLulav* 7:13, 15–16; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 658:1).

NOTES

That the *lulav* should be taken and the day of waving – שְׁיֵהָא לְוֹלֵב נִשְׁלַל יוֹם הַנֶּהֱפֵךְ – Some commentaries suggest that these two ordinances of Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai were instituted at the same time, which is why they are always mentioned together, despite the fact that there is no connection between them (*Tosafot* in tractate *Sukka*). In a homiletic vein, some state that these two ordinances were instituted together as they apparently contradict one another. The ordinance concerning the *lulav* expands a mitzva that was formerly exclusive to the Temple to include the entire country, whereas the prohibition of the day of waving serves as a reminder that the Temple is not standing, although it may be rebuilt at any moment (*Arukh LaNer*).

Where it was rebuilt at night – דְּאִיבְנֵי בְּלִילְיָא – Here and in the parallel discussion in tractate *Sukka*, the commentaries note that the building of the Temple does not override the Festival, which means it cannot be built on the fifteenth of Tishrei. Furthermore, the Temple may not be built at night. Some explain that as the future Temple will come down in completed form from Heaven, this can occur at any time (Rashi). Alternatively, a court that is not well-versed in these *halakhot* might build it at these times due to its great love for the Temple (*Meiri*).

HALAKHA

The time of the prohibition of new grain – זְמַן אִסּוּר חֲדָשׁ – It is prohibited to eat new grain from the five types of grain until the *omer* is brought, which is on the sixteenth day of Nisan. Nowadays, when there is no *omer* offering, it is prohibited to eat the new grain for the entire day of the sixteenth. In the Diaspora, due to the uncertainty over the date, it is prohibited to eat the new grain also for the entire seventeenth of Nisan. However, the custom is not to be strict about this second day, although a pious person should be stringent (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 489:4; Shulḥan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 293:1; see also Magen Avraham*).

The time of permitting the new grain during the time of the Temple – זְמַן הַתֵּיר הַחֲדָשׁ בְּזְמַן הַבַּיִת – When the Temple was standing it was permitted to eat the new grain immediately after the sacrificing of the *omer*. Those located far from Jerusalem were permitted to eat it after midday, as the court certainly would not delay offering it beyond that hour (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot 10:2*).

וְשִׁיְהָא יוֹם הַנֶּהֱפֵךְ כּוֹלּוֹ אָסוּר.

And for similar reasons, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai instituted that for the entire day of waving the *omer* offering, i.e., the sixteenth of Nisan, eating the grain of the new crop is prohibited.^{NH} By Torah law, when the Temple is standing the new grain may not be eaten until after the *omer* offering is brought on the sixteenth of Nisan, usually early in the morning. When the Temple is not standing it may be eaten from the time that the eastern horizon is illuminated at daybreak. However, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai instituted a prohibition against eating the new grain throughout the entire sixteenth of Nisan, until the seventeenth, to commemorate the Temple.

GEMARA The Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that one performs actions in commemoration of the Temple? As the verse states: “For I will restore health to you, and I will heal you of your wounds, said the Lord; because they have called you an outcast: She is Zion, there is none who care for her” (Jeremiah 30:17). This verse teaches by inference that Jerusalem requires caring through acts of commemoration.

§ The mishna taught: Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai also instituted that for the entire day of waving the *omer* offering, eating the grain of the new crop is prohibited. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this ordinance? The reasoning is that soon the Temple will be rebuilt and people will say: Last year, when the Temple was in ruins, didn't we eat from the new crop as soon as the eastern horizon was illuminated on the morning of the sixteenth of Nisan, as the new crop was permitted immediately? Now too, let us eat the new grain at that time.

And they do not know that last year, when there was no *omer*, the eastern horizon illuminating, i.e., the morning of the sixteenth of Nisan, served to permit the consumption of the new grain immediately. However, now that the Temple has been rebuilt and there is an *omer* offering, it is the *omer* that permits the consumption of the new grain. When the Temple is standing, the new grain is not permitted until the *omer* offering has been sacrificed.

The Gemara clarifies: In this scenario, when is it that the Temple was built? If we say that it was rebuilt on the sixteenth of Nisan, then the Temple was not standing in the morning and therefore the eastern horizon illuminating indeed rendered eating the new grain permitted, as it was not yet possible to bring the *omer* offering.

Rather, you must say that it was rebuilt on the fifteenth of Nisan or on some earlier date, in which case the new grain would not become permitted by the illumination of the eastern horizon. In that scenario, from midday onward let it be permitted to eat the new grain, as didn't we learn in a mishna in tractate *Menahot*: The people distant from Jerusalem, who are unaware of the precise time when the *omer* was brought, are permitted to eat the new grain from midday onward,^H because the members of the court are not indolent with regard to the *omer* offering and would certainly have sacrificed it by midday. If so, now too, it should be permitted to eat the new grain beginning at that time. Why did Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai prohibit it for the entire day?

The Gemara answers: This ordinance was necessary only in a case where the Temple was rebuilt on the fifteenth adjacent to sunset. Alternatively, in a situation where the Temple was rebuilt at night,^N on the evening of the sixteenth, and there was no opportunity to cut the *omer* that night. In either case there is insufficient time to complete all the preparations so that the offering can be sacrificed by noon the next day. If people eat the new grain at midday, they will have retroactively transgressed a prohibition. Therefore, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai instituted that the new grain should be prohibited for the entire day of the sixteenth.

Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: That is not the reason. Rather, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai

גַּמְ' וּמְנַלְן דְּעִבְדִּינן זְכַר לְמִקְדָּשׁ? דְּאָמַר קָרָא: “כִּי אֶעֱלֶה אֲרוּכָה לָךְ וּמִמְבוֹתֶיךָ אֲרַפְּאֵךְ נְאֻם ה' כִּי נִרְחַה קְרָאוֹ לָךְ צִיּוֹן הִיא דְּוִישׁ אֵין לָהּ” – מִבְּלָל דְּבַעֲיָא דְּרִישָׁה.

“וְשִׁיְהָא יוֹם הַנֶּהֱפֵךְ כּוֹלּוֹ אָסוּר.” מַאי טַעְמָא? מַהֲרָה יִבְנֶה בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, וְיֵאמְרוּ: אֲשֶׁתִּקְדַּ מִי לֹא אֶכְלֶנּוּ בְּהַאִיר מוֹרַח? עֲכָשְׂיוּ נְמִי יִכְבוֹל.

וְלֹא יָדְעֵי דְּאֲשֶׁתִּקְדַּ לֹּא הוּוּה עוֹמֵר – הַאִיר מוֹרַח הַתֵּיר; הֲשֶׁתָּא דְּאִיבָא עוֹמֵר – עוֹמֵר מַתִּיר.

דְּמִיבְנֵי אֵימַת? אֵילִימָא דְּאִיבְנֵי בְּשִׁיתֶסֶר – הַרִי הַאִיר מוֹרַח הַתֵּיר.

אֲלָא דְּאִיבְנֵי בְּחַמִּיסֵר – מִחֲצוֹת הַיּוֹם וְלִהְלֵן לְשִׁתְּרֵי, דְּהָא תַּנּוּ: הֲרַחֲוִקִין מוֹתְרִין מִחֲצוֹת הַיּוֹם וְלִהְלֵן, לְפִי שְׂאִין בֵּית דִּן מִתְעַצְלִים בּוֹ!

לֹא נִצְרָכָא דְּאִיבְנֵי בְּחַמִּיסֵר סְמוּךְ לְשִׁקִּיעַת הַחֲמָה. אֵי נְמִי – דְּאִיבְנֵי בְּלִילְיָא.

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: רַבֵּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַכַּאי

בְּשִׁיטת רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמְרָה, דְּאָמַר: "עַד עֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה" – עַד עֵצְמוֹ שֶׁל יוֹם. וְקִסְרָה: עַד – וְעַד בְּכֻלּוֹ.

וּמִי סָבַר לָהּ בְּוֹתִיחָהּ? וְהָא מְפָלִיג פְּלִיג עֲלֶיהָ, דְּתַנּוּ: מִשְׁחָרַב בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הִתְקִין רַבֵּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַבְדַּי שֶׁיִּהְיֶה יוֹם הַנֶּהֱפָלָה בְּיָמָיו אֲסוּר. אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: וְהִלָּא מִן הַתּוֹרָה הוּא אֲסוּר, דְּכָתוּב: "עַד עֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה!"

הֵתֵם רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הוּא דְקָא טְעִי. אִיהוּ סָבַר: רַבֵּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַבְדַּי מְדַרְבְּנֵי קָאָמַר. וְלֹא הִיא, מְדֹאֲרֵי יִתָּא קָאָמַר.

וְהָא הִתְקִין קְתַנִּי! מַאי "הִתְקִין"? דְּרַשׁ וְהִתְקִין.

מִתְנִי בְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה הִיוּ מְקַבְּלִין עֲדוֹת הַחֹדֶשׁ כָּל הַיּוֹם.

פְּעִים אָחַת נִשְׁתַּחֲוּ הָעֵדִים מְלָבּוּא, וְנִתְקַלְקְלוּ הַלְלוֹם בְּשִׁיר. הִתְקִינוּ שְׁלֹא יִהְיוּ מְקַבְּלִין אֶלָּא עַד הַמִּנְחָה.

stated his decree in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda,^N who said: When the verse states: "And you shall eat neither bread nor parched corn, nor fresh stalks, until this selfsame [etzem] day, until you have brought the offering of your God" (Leviticus 23:14), this does not teach that it is permitted to eat the new grain on the morning of the sixteenth when the eastern horizon is illuminated. Rather, it is prohibited until the essence [atzmo] of the day. And he holds that when the verse says: Until that day, it means until and including this date. If so, by Torah law, eating the new grain is permitted only after the conclusion of the sixteenth, unless the omer offering was sacrificed, in which case it is permitted to eat the new grain immediately afterward.

The Gemara asks: **And does Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda? But he disagrees with him, as we learned in a mishna (Sukka 41a): After the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai instituted that for the entire day of waving the omer offering, eating the grain of the new crop is prohibited.^H Rabbi Yehuda said: But isn't it prohibited by Torah law, as it is written: "Until this selfsame day"?** This indicates that Rabbi Yehuda disagrees with Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai.

The Gemara rejects this argument. **There, it was Rabbi Yehuda who erred^N in his understanding. He thought that Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai was saying that eating new grain on the sixteenth of Nisan is prohibited by rabbinic law. But that is not so; he was actually saying that it is prohibited by Torah law.**

The Gemara raises a difficulty. **But it is taught in the mishna: Instituted.** This term is referring to a rabbinic ordinance, not a Torah law. The Gemara explains: **What is the meaning of the term instituted?** It means that Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai interpreted the verse, and instituted that this is how one should act from now onward. When the Temple was standing there was no need for this *halakha*, as it was permitted to eat the new grain after the sacrificing of the omer.

MISHNA Initially, they would accept testimony to determine the start of the month throughout the entire thirtieth day from the beginning of the month of Elul, before Rosh HaShana, and if witnesses arrived from afar and testified that they had sighted the New Moon the previous night, they would declare that day the Festival.

Once, the witnesses tarried coming^N until the hour was late, and the Levites erred with regard to the song,^N i.e., the psalm that they were supposed to recite, as they did not know at the time whether it was a Festival or an ordinary weekday. From that point on, the Sages instituted that they would accept testimony to determine the start of the month only^N until *minḥa* time.^H If witnesses had not arrived by that hour, they would declare Elul a thirty-day month and calculate the dates of the Festivals accordingly.

HALAKHA

Time of permission to eat the new grain – תּוֹרַת הַחֹדֶשׁ: When the Temple is not standing it is prohibited to eat the new grain throughout sixteenth of *Nisan*, in accordance with Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak's explanation of Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai's opinion (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 10:2).

Testimony to determine the start of the month – עֲדוֹת הַחֹדֶשׁ: At first the court would accept testimony to determine the

start of the new month throughout the thirtieth day of the previous month. On one occasion the witnesses were delayed and did not arrive until the evening, and the Temple service was spoiled, as they did not know what to do. The court subsequently instituted that they would accept testimony only until *minḥa* time, so that they would manage to sacrifice the additional offerings and the afternoon daily offering with their libations (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Kiddush HaHodesh* 3:5).

NOTES

The opinion of Rabbi Yehuda – שִׁיטת רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: The differences of opinion with regard to this *halakha* are based on divergent interpretations of the main verse on this topic: "And you shall eat neither bread nor parched corn, nor fresh stalks, until this selfsame day, until you have brought the offering of your God" (Leviticus 23:14). Clearly the prohibition against eating the new grain lapses at a certain point in time. However, the two details mentioned in the verse are not identical. "Until this selfsame day" refers to a date, whereas: "Until you have brought," depends on the performance of an action, i.e., the sacrifice of the omer offering. According to the opinion of the Rabbis, the action refers to the period when the Temple is standing and the omer offering is brought, while the date is applicable when the Temple does not exist. Conversely, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, the phrase: "This selfsame day" means the entire day, and therefore the prohibition to eat the new grain ends only after the entire sixteenth day is over.

There it was Rabbi Yehuda who erred – הֵתֵם רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: Many commentaries are puzzled by this statement of Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak. Why does he deem it necessary to depart from the plain meaning of the mishna? Furthermore, why should one explain that Rabbi Yehuda erred? Different resolutions have been suggested. One is that Rav Nahman's explanation provides a distinct advantage: According to the standard interpretation of the mishna Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai instituted a permanent ordinance based on a far-fetched concern, lest the Temple be built a day or less before the time for the omer offering. By contrast, according to Rav Nahman's interpretation, Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai's decision is straightforward, as he applied Torah law.

The witnesses tarried coming – נִשְׁתַּחֲוּ הָעֵדִים מְלָבּוּא: The Jerusalem Talmud relates that there was unrest in the city and foreign soldiers prevented the witnesses from arriving on time.

The Levites erred with regard to the song – וְנִתְקַלְקְלוּ הַלְלוֹם: The early authorities ask why the mishna doesn't state that the Temple service itself was spoiled, as they did not bring the additional offering for Rosh HaShana (see *Tosafot*). Indeed, some commentaries maintain that the main reason is the ruin of the offerings, and the error with regard to the song is merely an additional reason (Rambam). Others contend that there was no error with regard to the offerings, as they would sacrifice the additional offerings conditionally: If today is Rosh HaShana this is an additional offering, and if not, it is for the repletion of the altar, i.e., a burnt-offering sacrificed at times when the altar was idle (*Tosafot*; Rid). Everyone agrees that they sacrificed the additional offerings after the afternoon daily offering, despite the positive mitzva that the daily offering must complete the day's offerings, either because the mitzva of the additional offerings overrides that positive mitzva (*Tosafot*; Rashba), or because that mitzva does not apply in exigent circumstances (*Meiri*). However, no such solution was available with regard to the song, as they could not offer the libations the next day and recite the song, because the song is recited only for libations offered at the proper time (Rosh).

They instituted that they would accept only, etc. – הִתְקִינוּ: The plain meaning of this statement is that this error occurred on a regular New Moon, and the decree was established for all months of the year. However, it is possible to conclude otherwise from Rashi's comments. Some write explicitly that this principle was established only for Rosh HaShana, as the same concern does not apply to other months (*Meiri*; *Turei Even*; see the difficulties raised by the later authorities).

From *minḥa* time onward – מן המנחה ולמעלה: The precise time of this *minḥa* is unclear. Some maintain that this refers to *minḥa ketana*, lesser, later *minḥa*, i.e., nine and a half hours after sunrise, not *minḥa gedola*, greater, earlier *minḥa*, which is half an hour after halakhic noon (*Turei Even*). Rashi in *Beitza* (4b) and elsewhere indicates that *minḥa* time is the time of the sacrifice of the afternoon daily offering.

HALAKHA

Witnesses came from *minḥa* time – באו עדים מן המנחה: If the witnesses come after *minḥa* time on Rosh HaShana, i.e., the thirtieth day after the start of Elul, that day is observed as a Festival and no prohibited labor may be performed. However, the additional offerings are sacrificed the next day, as the court does not sanctify the month after *minḥa* time (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Kiddush HaHodesh* 3:6).

The ordinance of Rabban Yohanan – תקנת רבן יוחנן: After the Temple was destroyed Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai instituted that the court should receive the testimony to determine the start of the month throughout the entire day. In other words, even if witnesses came on the thirtieth close to sunset, their testimony is accepted and that day is sanctified as Rosh HaShana (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Kiddush HaHodesh* 3:6).

The song of Rosh HaShana – שיר של ראש השנה: To accompany the additional offering of Rosh HaShana the Levites would recite: “Sing aloud to God our strength” (Psalms 81:2). If Rosh HaShana occurred on Thursday they would recite: “I removed his shoulder from the burden” (Psalms 81:7), while at *minḥa* of Rosh HaShana they would recite (Psalms 29:8): “The voice of the Lord shakes the wilderness” (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 6:9).

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Zeira – רבי זעירא: Born in Babylonia, Rabbi Zeira, known in the Jerusalem Talmud as Rabbi Ze'ira, became one of the great third-generation *amora'im* of Eretz Yisrael. His father, a tax collector for the Persian government, was praised as one of the few who performed that function honestly. When Rabbi Zeira ascended to Eretz Yisrael, he decided to identify himself entirely with the Torah of Eretz Yisrael. The Gemara relates that he undertook one hundred fasts to forget the Torah he studied in Babylonia. Rabbi Zeira was renowned for his sharp intellect, and authored many incisive *halakhot*. He was also known as an extremely God-fearing man, as attested by several stories. Due to his modesty, he did not even want to be ordained with the title Rabbi. He relented only after being told that ordination atones for one's sins.

The Gemara relates that he undertook one hundred additional fasts so that the fire of Gehenna would not harm him, and he would test himself by entering a fiery furnace. On one occasion his legs were scorched, and from then on he was called: The little man with the scorched legs (*Bava Metzia* 85a). Rabbi Zeira was a contemporary of Rav Hisda, Rav Sheshet, and Rabba in Babylonia, and of the disciples of Rabbi Yohanan in Eretz Yisrael, with whom he engaged in extensive halakhic discourse. Apparently, he was a flax merchant in Eretz Yisrael, and it is likely that for business reasons he returned to Babylonia several times.

The text of the beginning of Rabbi Zeira's eulogy is preserved in the Talmud: The land of Shinar, i.e., Babylonia, conceived and gave birth; the land of splendor, i.e., Eretz Yisrael, raised her delight. Woe to me, said Reket, i.e., Tiberias, as she has lost her beloved instrument (*Megilla* 6a).

Rabbi Zeira's son, Rabbi Ahava, was a Sage in the following generation.

ואם באו עדים מן המנחה ולמעלה – ונהגין אותו היום קודש, ולמחרת קודש.

משחרב בית המקדש התקין רבן יוחנן בן זכאי שיהו מקבלין עדות החדש כל היום.

גמ' מה קלקול קלקלו הלויים בשיר? הכא תרגימו: שלא אמרו שירה כל עיקר. רבי זירא אמר: שאמרו שירה של חול עם תמיד של בין הערבים.

אמר לו רבי זירא לאהבה בריה: פוק תני להו: התקינו שלא יהו מקבלין עדות החדש אלא בדי שיהא שהות ביום להקריב תמידין ומוספין ונסביהם, ולומר שירה שלא בשיבוש. אי אמרת בשלמא אמור שירה דחול – היינו דאיכא שיבוש; אלא אי אמרת לא אמור כלל – מאי שיבוש איכא?

בין דלא אמור כלל אין לך שיבוש גדול מזה.

מתיב רב אחא בר הונא: תמיד של ראש השנה, שחרית – קרב כהלקתו. במוסף מהו אומר? “הרגינו לאלהים עזונו הריעו לאלהי יעקב”. במנחה מהו אומר? “קול ה' יחיל מדבר”.

ובזמן שחל ראש השנה להיות בחמישי בשבת שהשירה שלו “הרגינו לאלהים עזונו” – לא היה אומר בשחרית “הרגינו”, מפני שחזרו וכוּפלו את הפרק.

אלא מהו אומר? “הסירותי מסבל שבמו”. ואם באו עדים אחר תמיד של שחר – אומר “הרגינו” אף על פי שחזרו וכוּפלו את הפרק.

And if witnesses came from *minḥa* time^h onward,^N although the calculations for the dates of the Festivals would begin from the following day, the people would nevertheless observe that day, on which the witnesses arrived, as sacred, so that in future years they would not treat the entire day as a weekday and engage in labor from the morning on the assumption that the witnesses will arrive only after *minḥa* time. And they would also observe the following day as sacred. On the second day, they observed Rosh HaShana in full, both by sacrificing its offerings as well as by calculating the upcoming Festivals from that date.

After the Temple was destroyed and there was no longer any reason for this ordinance, Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai instituted that they would once again accept testimony to determine the start of the month the entire day.^h

GEMARA The Gemara asks: What error did the Levites make with regard to the song they were supposed to recite? The Gemara answers: Here, in Babylonia, they interpreted that they did not recite any song at all, as they did not know which psalm should be sung, the one for an ordinary weekday or the special one for the Festival. Rabbi Zeira^p said: Their mistake was that they recited the song of an ordinary weekday with the daily afternoon offering. After the witnesses testified, it became clear that they should have recited the psalm of the Festival.

Rabbi Zeira said to his son Ahava: Go out and teach the following *baraita* to the Sages of Babylonia: They instituted that on Rosh HaShana the court would accept testimony to determine the start of the month only if there was enough time left in the day to sacrifice the daily offerings and the additional offerings of the Festival and their libations, and to recite the appropriate song without a mistake. Granted, if you say that they recited the song of an ordinary weekday, this is a case in which there is a mistake. However, if you say that they did not recite any psalm at all, what mistake is there? The term: Mistake, indicates the performance of an incorrect action.

The Gemara explains: Since they did not recite any psalm at all, you do not have a mistake greater than this. The failure to recite the appropriate psalm disrupts the entire sacrificial service.

Rav Aḥa bar Huna raised an objection from a *baraita*: With regard to the daily offering on Rosh HaShana, in the morning it is sacrificed in accordance with its regular *halakhot*, i.e., the Levites recite the regular psalm for that day of the week. When it comes to the additional offering of Rosh HaShana, what psalm does one recite? The psalm that includes the verse: “Sing aloud to God our strength; shout to the God of Jacob” (Psalms 81:2). With regard to the daily afternoon offering, what psalm does one recite? The psalm that includes the verse: “The voice of the Lord shakes the wilderness” (Psalms 29:8).

And when Rosh HaShana occurs on a Thursday, whose regular psalm even on an ordinary weekday is: “Sing aloud to God our strength,” and the witnesses came before the daily morning offering was sacrificed, one would not recite: “Sing aloud to God our strength; shout to the God of Jacob” with the daily morning offering, because one goes back and repeats that section at the time of the additional offering.

Rather, what does one recite? “I removed his shoulder from the burden” (Psalms 81:7), which is referring to Joseph, who was set free from prison on Rosh HaShana. In other words, the second half of Psalm 81 was recited with the morning offering, while the first half was recited with the additional offering. And if the witnesses came on a Thursday after the daily morning offering had already been sacrificed, one recites: “Sing aloud to God” at the additional offering, even though this means that one goes back and repeats that section^h again. This concludes the *baraita*.

אי אָמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא בַּל הֵיכָא דְמִסְתַּפְקָא
אָמְרִינְן שִׁירָה דְחוּל – הֵינֵי דְקָאֵמַר אֹמְרוּ
וּכְפִלּוּ. אֲלֵא אִי אָמַרְתָּ לֹא אָמַר בְּלָל –
מֵאִי “אֹמְרוּ וּכְפִלּוּ”?

The Gemara explains the objection from this *baraita*: **Granted, if you say that anywhere there is a doubt with regard to what to say, one recites the song of an ordinary weekday, this is the meaning of that which the *tanna* states: One recites the psalm for an ordinary weekday and then repeats it. However, if you say that in a case of doubt no psalm is recited at all, what is the meaning of the clause: One recites it and repeats it?**

Perek IV
Daf 31 Amud a

שְׁאֵי הָתֵם, דְּשִׁירָה דְיִמְיָה הִיא.

The Gemara rejects this argument. **It is different there, as in any case “Sing aloud” is the psalm of the day, either because it was an ordinary Thursday or because it was Rosh HaShana. However, there is no proof from here that in all uncertain cases they would recite the psalm for an ordinary weekday, as it is possible that they did not recite any psalm at all.**

תִּנְיָא, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר מִשּׁוּם רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא:
בְּרֵאשׁוֹן מָה הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים? “לֹה’ הָאָרֶץ
וּמְלוֹאָה”, עַל שֵׁם שְׂקֵנָה וְהִקְנָה וְשִׁלִּיט
בְּעוֹלָמוֹ.

The Gemara expands on the topic of the daily psalms recited by the Levites. **It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda said in the name of Rabbi Akiva: On the first day of the week, Sunday, what psalm would the Levites recite? The psalm beginning with the phrase: “The earth is the Lord’s, and its fullness” (Psalms 24:1), in commemoration of the first day of Creation, because on that day He acquired the world and transferred it to man, and He was the only ruler in His world,^N as the angels were not created until the second day.**

בְּשֵׁנִי מָה הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “גְּדוֹל ה’ וּמְהוּלָּל
מְאֹד”, עַל שֵׁם שְׁחִיִּילֵק מִעֲשָׂיו וּמִלְךְ
עַלֵּיהֶן.

On the second day of the week what psalm would the Levites recite? The psalm that begins: **“Great is the Lord, and highly to be praised in the city of our God, His sacred mountain” (Psalms 48:2). This is because on the second day of Creation He separated His works,^N dividing between the upper waters and the lower waters, and ruled over them as King; and this psalm speaks of Jerusalem as “The city of a great King” (Psalms 48:3).**

בְּשִׁלִּישִׁי הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “אֱלֹהִים נֹצֵב בְּעֵדוֹת
אֵל”, עַל שֵׁם שְׁגִילָה אֶרֶץ בְּחֻכְמָתוֹ וְהִכִּין
תֵּבֵל לְעֵדוֹתוֹ. בְּרַבִּיעִי הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “אֵל
נִקְמָתוֹ ה’” – עַל שֵׁם שְׁבָרָא חֲמָה וּלְבָנָה,
וְעֵתִיד לִפְרַע מְעוֹבְדֵיהֶן.

On the third day of the week they would recite the psalm beginning: “God stands in the congregation of God” (Psalms 82:1), because on the third day of Creation He revealed the land in His wisdom and thereby prepared the world for His assembly^N that could now live on the dry land. On the fourth day of the week they would recite the psalm beginning: “O Lord God, to Whom vengeance belongs” (Psalms 94:1), because on the fourth day of Creation He created the sun and the moon, and in the future He will punish and take vengeance upon those who worship them.

בְּחַמִּישִׁי הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “הֲרִנְנוּ לְאֱלֹהִים
עוֹזְנֵנוּ” – עַל שֵׁם שְׁבָרָא עוֹפוֹת וְדִגִּים
לְשִׁבַח לְשִׁמּוֹ. בְּשִׁשִּׁי הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “ה’ מֶלֶךְ
גְּאוּת לְבָשׁ” – עַל שֵׁם שְׁגֻמְר מְלֹאכְתּוֹ,
וּמִלְךְ עַלֵּיהֶן. בְּשַׁבְּעִי הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים: “מִזְמוֹר
שִׁיר לְיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת” – לְיוֹם שְׂבוּלוֹ שַׁבָּת.

On the fifth day of the week the Levites would recite the psalm beginning: “Sing aloud to God our strength” (Psalms 81:2), because on the fifth day of Creation He created birds and fish to praise His name.^N On the sixth day of the week they would recite the psalm beginning: “The Lord reigns, He is clothed with majesty” (Psalms 93:1), because on that day He completed His labor^N and ruled over all of creation in full glory. On the seventh day of the week, Shabbat, they would recite the psalm beginning: “A psalm, a song for the day of Shabbat” (Psalms 92:1), as the future world will be a day that is all Shabbat.^H

אָמַר רַבִּי נְחֵמְיָא: מָה רָאוּ חֲכָמִים לְחַלֵּק
בֵּין הַפְּרָקִים הַלְלוּ אֱלֹא: בְּרֵאשׁוֹן – שְׂקֵנָה
וְהִקְנָה וְשִׁלִּיט בְּעוֹלָמוֹ. בְּשֵׁנִי – שְׁחִיִּילֵק
מִעֲשָׂיו וּמִלְךְ עַלֵּיהֶם. בְּשִׁלִּישִׁי – שְׁגִילָה
אֶרֶץ בְּחֻכְמָתוֹ וְהִכִּין תֵּבֵל לְעֵדוֹתוֹ.

Rabbi Nehemya said: **What did the Sages see that led them to distinguish between these chapters, as they interpret the psalms recited on the six weekdays as referring to the past, whereas the psalm recited on Shabbat is referring to the future. Rather, all of the psalms refer to the past. The first six are as explained above: On the first day, the reason is that He acquired the world and transferred it to man, and He was the only ruler in His world; on the second day, the reason is that He separated His works and ruled over them as King; on the third day, the reason is that He revealed the land in His wisdom and thereby prepared the world for His assembly.**

NOTES

He acquired and transferred and was the ruler in His world – קָנָה וְהִקְנָה וְשִׁלִּיט בְּעוֹלָמוֹ: The phrase: He acquired [*kana*], is based on the verse: “Maker [*koneh*] of heaven and earth” (Genesis 14:19), i.e., He is their master and owner. The phrase: And He transferred [*hikna*], means that he transferred control of the world to mankind, as it says: “But the earth He has given to the children of men” (Psalms 115:16). Finally, the phrase: Ruler in His world, indicates that although He transferred possession of the world to its inhabitants, He nevertheless remains its ultimate ruler (*Otzar HaKavod*).

Because He separated His works – עַל שֵׁם שְׁחִיִּילֵק – מִעֲשָׂיו: Just as God divided the upper and lower waters, so too He formed a division within the lower world by establishing a special place for the Divine Presence in Jerusalem and the Temple (Maharsha).

And prepared the world for His assembly – וְהִכִּין וְהִבְלִיל לְעֵדוֹתוֹ: The commentaries explain that this psalm speaks about judges and Sages, and that the world exists due to the merit of the Torah they study and the justice they mete out, as it is stated: “If not My covenant day and night I would not have appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth” (Jeremiah 33:25; see *Arukh* and Maharsha).

Birds and fish to praise His name – עוֹפוֹת וְדִגִּים – לְשִׁבַח לְשִׁמּוֹ: Rashi explains that when one sees the abundance of God’s creatures, he will offer thanksgiving and praise God’s name. Some cite proof for this from the term used in the verse: Sing [*harninu*], which is in the active causative form, i.e., they themselves are not the singers; rather, they cause others to sing (*Iyyei HaYam*; see *Perek Shira* for the song of the birds and other creatures).

He completed His labor – שְׁגֻמְר מְלֹאכְתּוֹ: As it states in this psalm: “The world is established that it cannot be moved” (Psalms 93:1; see Maharsha).

HALAKHA

The song of the day – שִׁיר שֶׁל יוֹם: Every morning the Levites would recite a different song, as explained in the Gemara. Nowadays it is customary to recite these psalms as part of the morning prayers (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 6:9).