

“ואין חותכין אותו בין בדבר שהוא משום שבות ובין בדבר שהוא משום לא תעשה.” משום שבות – מגלגל; לא תעשה – סכינא.

השתא משום שבות אמרת לא. לא תעשה מיבעינא? זו ואין צריך לומר זו קתני.

“אבל אם רצה ליתן לתוכו מים או יין יתן.” מים או יין – אין, מי רגלים – לא.

מתניתין מני? אבא שאול היא. דתנא, אבא שאול אומר: מים או יין – מותר, כדי לְצַחְצְחוּ. מי רגלים – אסור, מפני הכבוד.

“אין מעכבין את התינוקות מלתקוע.” הא נשים – מעכבין. והתנא: אין מעכבין לא את הנשים ולא את התינוקות מלתקוע ביום טוב! אמר אביי: לא קשיא; הא – רבי יהודה, הא – רבי יוסי ורבי שמעון.

דתנא, “דבר אל בני ישראל” – בני ישראל סומכין ואין בנות ישראל סומכות, דברי רבי יהודה. רבי יוסי ורבי שמעון אומרים: נשים סומכות רשות.

§ The mishna stated: **One may not cut the shofar if it needs to be prepared, neither with an object that is prohibited due to a rabbinic decree nor with an object that may not be used due to a Torah prohibition.** The Gemara explains: An example of an object prohibited due to a rabbinic decree is a sickle,^{NB} which is not ordinarily used for preparing a shofar; an example of an object that may not be used due to a prohibition by Torah law is a knife.

The Gemara asks: **Now that you have said that to sound the shofar one may not perform an action that is prohibited due to rabbinic law, is it necessary to say that one may not perform an action that violates a prohibition by Torah law?** The Gemara answers: The mishna teaches employing the style: **This, and it is unnecessary to say that.**

§ The mishna continues. **However, if one wishes to place water or wine into the shofar on Rosh HaShana, so that it should emit a clear sound, he may place it.** The Gemara infers: **Water or wine, yes, one may insert these substances into a shofar. However, urine, whose acidity is good for the shofar, no.**^H

The Gemara asks: **Who is the tanna of the mishna?** The Gemara answers: **It is Abba Shaul, as it is taught in a baraita that Abba Shaul says:** With regard to water or wine, one is permitted to pour these liquids into a shofar on Rosh HaShana in order to make its sound clear. However, with regard to urine, one is prohibited to do so due to the respect^N that must be shown to the shofar. Although urine is beneficial, it is disrespectful to place it in a shofar, which serves for a mitzva.

§ The mishna further teaches: **One need not prevent children from sounding the shofar on Rosh HaShana.** The Gemara infers: **If women wish to sound the shofar, one indeed prevents them from doing so.** The Gemara asks: **Isn’t it taught in a baraita that one does not prevent^H women or children from sounding the shofar on a Festival?** The Gemara answers that **Abaye said:** This is **not difficult:** This mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda**, while that **baraita** is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon.**

As it is taught in a **baraita:** “**Speak to the children of Israel... and he shall place his hands upon the head of the burnt-offering**” (Leviticus 1:2–4). The phrase “children of Israel” literally means sons of Israel, and this teaches that **the sons of Israel place their hands upon offerings, but the daughters of Israel do not place^N their hands upon offerings;** this is the statement of **Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say:** It is optional for women to place their hands on the head of an offering before it is slaughtered, although they are not obligated to do so.^H Apparently, according to the opinion of **Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon**, if a woman wishes to perform any mitzva that is not obligatory for her, she is permitted to do so. Here too, one does not prevent a woman from sounding the shofar.

BACKGROUND

Sickle – מגלגל: The sickle is one of the most ancient harvesting tools, consisting of a metal blade, usually curved, attached to a short wooden handle. Harvesting with a sickle is a very slow process. However, due to its simplicity and low cost, the sickle is still widely used throughout the world, especially for reaping grains such as wheat and rice. It is also used as a gardening tool.



Ancient Greek iron sickle

HALAKHA

Urine is prohibited – מי רגלים אסור: On the Festival day it is permitted to place water, wine, or vinegar in a shofar to make its sound clear. However, it is prohibited to place urine in a shofar, even during the week, as this is disrespectful of the mitzva, even if the one who sounds the shofar does not mind (*Mishna Berura*). The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Abba Shaul (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 586:23).

One does not prevent – אין מעכבין: Although women are exempt from sounding the shofar on Rosh HaShana, they may do so if they wish. This is also true with regard to a child (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 589:6).

Placing for women – סמיכה בנשים: Women are not obligated to place their hands on offerings. Some authorities indicate that women may not do so at all, as stated in the mishna, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (Rambam). Others hold that the halakha in this matter is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon (*Tosafot*). Whether or not a woman may perform a mitzva that she is not obligated in has many ramifications for different areas of halakha (*Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 3:8).

NOTES

Due to rabbinic decree, a sickle, etc. – משום שבות מגלגל וכו': Some versions of the text switch the two tools, i.e., the knife is prohibited by rabbinic decree while the sickle is prohibited by Torah law (Rosh; see Rif and Rambam's Commentary on the Mishna). The reasoning behind the standard version of the text is that a sickle is an instrument used primarily for reaping, not for cutting, and therefore it is prohibited to prepare a shofar with it by rabbinic decree. Conversely, a knife is used for cutting, and therefore its usage is prohibited by Torah law. Apparently, some early authorities maintain that the prohibition against using a sickle is more stringent because it is a vessel whose purpose, reaping, is prohibited on Festivals, whereas it is generally permitted to use a knife (Rabbi Yitzhak ibn Giat; see Rashba).

מי רגלים אסור – Urine is prohibited due to the respect – מפני הכבוד: The reasoning here is straightforward, as it is inappropriate to treat an object used for a mitzva in this manner. Furthermore, this might cause people to belittle the mitzva. Although dog feces were used for tanning parchments, even for writing sacred books, this was performed in an early stage of the tanning, when it was not yet ready for sacred purposes. Many compare this halakha to that of incense, as urine is prohibited in the preparation of incense for the same reason. Some suggest that just as incense is brought for a sanctified purpose, the sounding of the shofar has the legal status of a sacred service in the Temple, as it serves for remembrance (see *Sefat Emet*).

אין בנות ישראל סומכות – Daughters of Israel do not place – This halakha and its ramifications are the subject of a detailed debate among all the early authorities (see *Tosafot*). Apparently, women are exempt from placing their hands on an offering by decree of the Torah, although some say the reason is that placing the hands is a positive, time-bound mitzva, as it is performed immediately before slaughtering, which must be done during the day (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar). Since women are exempt from slaughtering, it is prohibited for them to place their hands on the offering, as this is part of the sacred service. Most halakhic authorities conclude from here that in general someone exempt from a certain mitzva is nevertheless permitted to perform it voluntarily (see Ran). The main dispute concerns cases of a possible prohibition and the recitation of a blessing. The authorities dispute these issues to this day.

NOTES

One occupies himself with them – מתעסקין בהם: Some early authorities cite Rashi's opinion that one indicates to children with facial movements that he wants them to sound the *shofar*. Others explain that the phrase: One occupies himself with them, means that one teaches them the *halakhot* of sounding the *shofar* orally, without actually sounding the instrument (see *Meiri*).

Even on Shabbat – אפילו בשבת: Some early authorities claim that the *shofar* may be sounded by children on Shabbat of Rosh HaShana only in places where sounding the *shofar* on these days is permitted (Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi; *Hashlama*). However, others hold that this *halakha* refers to a regular Shabbat (Rambam). In fact, the Rambam maintains that this is permitted on every Shabbat of the year except when Rosh HaShana occurs on Shabbat, so that people should not think that it is permitted to sound the *shofar* on this Shabbat (see *Mikhtam*).

HALAKHA

One does not prevent even on Shabbat – אין מעכבין אפילו – בשבת: Although one does not sound the *shofar* when Rosh HaShana occurs on Shabbat, it is permitted to tell a child who has not yet reached the age of training in mitzvot to sound it in order to learn how to blow it. With regard to a child who has reached the age of training, it is prohibited to tell him to sound it. However, if the child does so on his own, one need not protest, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar (*Tur, Orach Hayyim* 588).

Perek IV

Daf 33 Amud b

NOTES

A minor who has reached, etc. – קטן שהגיע וכו': The early authorities suggest two explanations of this *halakha* (Rif). First, in the case of a child who has reached the age of training in mitzvot, one teaches him how to sound a *shofar*, and certainly one does not prevent him from practicing, as his practicing is considered a mitzva. Conversely, with regard to a child who has not yet reached the age of training, his action does not constitute a mitzva at all, and therefore one should not help him. However, as he is also not obligated in the mitzva of refraining from labor on the Festival one should not prevent him from sounding a *shofar* either (Rashi).

The second opinion maintains the reverse: With regard to a child who has not yet reached the age of training in mitzvot, one may actively teach him to sound the *shofar*, as he is so young that there is no problem with him sounding it on Shabbat. However, in the case of a child who has reached the age of training, one may not teach him, as this would be teaching him to disregard Shabbat for the sounding of the *shofar*. Nevertheless, one should not actively prevent him, as at least he is learning how to sound a *shofar* (Rashba; Rabbi Yitzhak ibn Giat). Apparently, the dispute depends on whether the focus of the training is on the mitzva of Shabbat or on the mitzva of sounding the *shofar* (see *Meiri*).

HALAKHA

One who acts unawares with regard to sounding the *shofar* – המתעסק בתקעה: One who acts unawares when he sounds the *shofar* has not fulfilled his obligation. Moreover, one who hears this blast has not fulfilled his obligation. Likewise, one who sounds the *shofar* as a form of music, not for the purpose of the mitzva, does not fulfill his obligation. However, if one also intended to fulfill his obligation when sounding these blasts he does so, provided that the blasts were properly executed (*Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 589:8).

”אבל מתעסקין בהם עד שילמדו.” אמר רבי אלעזר: אפילו בשבת. תנא נמי הכי: מתעסקין בהן עד שילמדו. אפילו בשבת. ואין מעכבין התינוקות מלתקוע בשבת. ואין צריך לומר ביום טוב.

הא גופא קשיא: אמרת מתעסקין בהן עד שילמדו ואפילו בשבת – אלמא לכתחלה אמרינן תקעו. והדר תנא: אין מעכבין. עובבא הוא דלא מעכבין. הא לכתחלה – לא אמרינן תקעו!

לא קשיא: כאן –

§ The mishna further states: Rather, one occupies himself with them,^N encouraging and instructing children, until they learn how to sound it properly. Rabbi Elazar said: This applies even when Rosh HaShana occurs on Shabbat.^{NH} This is also taught in a *baraita*: One occupies himself with children until they learn to sound the *shofar* properly, even on Shabbat. And one does not prevent the children from sounding the *shofar* on Shabbat, and needless to say one does not prevent them on the festival of Rosh HaShana that occurs on a weekday.

The Gemara asks: This matter itself is difficult, i.e., there is an internal contradiction in the *baraita*. You said that one occupies himself with the children until they learn how to sound the *shofar*, and this applies even on Shabbat. Apparently, we say to them *ab initio*: Sound the *shofar*. And then the *baraita* taught: One does not prevent them from sounding the *shofar*, which indicates that although one does not prevent them from sounding it, we do not say *ab initio*: Sound it.

The Gemara explains: This is not difficult. Here,

בקטן שהגיע לחינוך. כאן – בקטן שלא הגיע לחינוך.

”והמתעסק לא יצא.” הא תוקע לשיר – יצא. לימא מסייע ליה לרבא, דאמר רבא: התוקע לשיר יצא. דלמא תוקע לשיר – נמי מתעסק קרי ליה:

”והשומע מן המתעסק לא יצא.” אבל השומע מן המשמיע לעצמו, מאי? יצא! לימא תיהוי תיובתיה דרבי זורא. דאמר ליה רבי זורא לשמעיה: איכוון ויתקע לי!

in the first clause, the *baraita* is dealing with a minor who has reached^N the age of training in mitzvot. This child is taught to sound the *shofar*, as one is obligated to teach him the proper way to perform mitzvot. However, here, in the second clause, the *baraita* is dealing with a minor who has not yet reached the age of training. Although one need not prevent this child from sounding the *shofar*, one does not encourage him to do so.

§ The mishna taught: One who acts unawares while sounding the *shofar*, without any intention to produce a sound, has not fulfilled his obligation.^H The Gemara infers: One who sounds a *shofar* for music, even if he has no intention to perform the mitzva, has fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara asks: Let us say that the mishna supports the opinion of Rava, as Rava said: One who sounds a *shofar* for music has fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara rejects this suggestion. There is no clear proof from here, as perhaps one who sounds a *shofar* for music is also called one who acts unawares. It is possible that the *tanna* of the mishna includes in this category anyone who sounds the *shofar* without a clear intention to fulfill the mitzva.

§ The mishna continues. And one who hears the *shofar* blasts from one who acts unawares has not fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara asks: However, one who hears the *shofar* blasts from one who is sounding the *shofar* for himself, without intention of sounding it for others, what is the *halakha*? The mishna apparently indicates that he has fulfilled his obligation. Let us say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rabbi Zeira, as Rabbi Zeira said to his attendant: Have the intention to sound the *shofar* on my behalf and sound it for me. This statement indicates that one must have the intention to enable the one who hears it to fulfill his obligation.

The order of the blasts – סדר תקיעות – By Torah law, a man is obligated to hear a complete set of blasts three times, which constitutes a total of nine sounds: *Tekia, terua, tekia* three times (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 590:1).

The length of a tekia – שיעור תקיעה: The length of each *tekia* must be the same as the total length of the middle *shofar* blasts. With regard to *terua*, some say that it is three staccato blasts of minimal length (Rashi). Others say that the *terua* is nine staccato blasts, equivalent to three sobbing sounds, each the length of three minimum blasts (Riva). This second opinion is common practice nowadays. When blowing the *shevarim* and *terua* together, the *tekia* before and after has to be longer, so as to be the same length as the middle blasts (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 590:3; *Mishna Berura*).

דלמא איידי דתנא רישא מתעסק, תנא סיפא נמי מתעסק.

The Gemara rejects this argument. Perhaps one can explain that since the first clause of the mishna taught the *halakha* with regard to one who acts unawares, the latter clause also taught the *halakha* with regard to one who acts unawares. If so, no inference may be drawn from here to the case of one who sounds the *shofar* for himself, with no intention of doing so for others.

מתני' סדר תקיעות: שלש של שלש שלש שלש. שיעור תקיעה בשלש תרועות: תקיעה ותקיעה בשלש יבבות. תקיעה בראשונה ומשך בשניה בשותם – אין בידי אלא אחת.

MISHNA The order of the blasts^H is three sets of three blasts each, which are: *Tekia, terua,* and *tekia*. The length of a *tekia*^H is equal to the length of three *teruot*,^N and the length of a *terua* is equal to the length of three whimpers. If one sounded the first *tekia* of the initial series of that series to the length of two *tekiot*, so that it should count as both the second *tekia* of the first set and the first *tekia* of the second set, he has in his hand the fulfillment of only one *tekia*, and he must begin the second set with a new *tekia*.

מי שפירך וחרך כך נתמנה לו שופר – תוקע ומריע ותוקע שלש פעמים.

With regard to one who recited the blessings of the additional prayer, and only afterward a *shofar* became available to him, he sounds a *tekia*, sounds a *terua*, and sounds a *tekia*, an order he repeats three times.

בשם ששליח צבור חייב – כך כל יחיד ויחיד חייב. רבן גמליאל אומר: שליח צבור מוציא את הרבים ידי חובתן.

Just as the prayer leader is obligated in the prayer of Rosh HaShana, so too, each and every individual is obligated in these prayers. Rabban Gamliel disagrees and says: Individuals are not obligated, as the prayer leader fulfills the obligation on behalf of the many.

גמ' והתנא: שיעור תקיעה בתרועה! אמר אביי: תנא דידן קא חשיב תקיעה דכולהו בבין ותרועות דכולהו בבין. תנא ברא – קא חשיב חד בבא, ותו לא.

GEMARA The Gemara raises a difficulty. Although the mishna taught that the length of a *tekia* is equal to the length of three *teruot*, isn't it taught in a *baraita* that the length of a single *tekia* is equal to the length of an entire *terua*, which is comprised of several shorter sounds? Abaye said: There is no difficulty. The *tanna* of our mishna counts the *tekia* of all the sets of blasts^N and the *teruot* of all the sets. He means that the length of the three *tekiot* is equal to the length of the three *teruot*. Conversely, the *tanna* of the *baraita* counts the first *tekia* of only one set, and no more, and therefore he simply states that the length of one *tekia* is equal to the length of one *terua*.

"שיעור תרועה בשלש יבבות." והתנא: שיעור תרועה בשלשה שבירים!

§ The mishna continues. The length of a *terua* is equal to the length of three whimpers.^N The Gemara asks: Isn't it taught in a *baraita* that the length of a *terua* is equal to the length of three *shevarim*, i.e., broken blasts, which presumably are longer than whimpers?

NOTES

The length of a *tekia* is equal to three *teruot* – שיעור תקיעה – Some commentaries write that these lengths are derived logically. Since one sounds a *tekia* before and after a *terua*, it is clear that the *tekia* depends on the *terua*. This is reasonable, as the Torah explicitly refers to a *terua*, not a *tekia* (*Penei Yehoshua*). According to this opinion, it is possible to explain the details of the ensuing dispute. Others explain that the Sages made the length of the *tekia* dependent on that of the *terua* because the *tekia* is a simple sound, which is difficult to estimate without the aid of measuring devices. Therefore, they linked the *tekia* to a *terua*, which is comprised of several short sounds, and short sounds are easier to measure (Ritva).

The *tekia* of all the sets of blasts – תקיעה דכולהו בבין – Abaye's answer is somewhat obscure. According to Rashi and most early authorities, Abaye maintains that the length of a *tekia* is the same as that of a *terua*, and the mishna is merely comparing the total length of the first *tekiot* with that of all three *teruot* in a particular sequence, without taking into account the final *tekia* of each set. Some commentaries note that this interpretation does not accord with the actual statement of Abaye. Neverthe-

less, they accept it as preferable to other explanations (Rashba). Others contend that the length of all six *tekiot* in a complete cycle of blasts should be as long as the three *teruot* in this cycle. According to this opinion, the length of each *tekia* is half as long as a *terua* (Rambam; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar, citing Rif).

There are several difficulties with this explanation. First, many authorities maintain that a *tekia* cannot be that short (Ran). Second, according to this explanation, the ruling in the mishna and *baraita* disagree, and yet Abaye subsequently states: In this matter the *tanna'im* certainly disagree, which indicates that until that point the two sources are in agreement.

The length of a *terua* is equal to three whimpers – שיעור תרועה בשלש יבבות: There is apparently a dispute between the commentaries with regard to the definition of a whimper. Is it a single, short, staccato sound? Or is it defined as three consecutive, short, broken sounds? One argument in favor of the second definition is that only three broken sounds together make the impression of a whimper, whereas one alone is not identifiable as such (see *Meiri* and *Mikhtam*).

In this matter the *tanna'im* certainly disagree – בהא ודאי – פליגי: Some maintain that once Abaye reached the conclusion that there is a dispute, he retracted his first explanation in favor of the claim that the first *baraita* and the mishna dispute the length of a *terua*, whether it is three *yevavot* or three *shevarim* (Ra'avad; Rashba). According to this opinion, the mishna and the *baraitot* do not disagree with regard to the length of a *tekia*, which is always three *teruot*, i.e., *shevarim*, each of which is three *yevavot*, or *terumitin* (see *Meiri*). However, Rashi and others indicate that Abaye's first explanation is not rejected at all. Rather, he rules that the length of the *tekia* must be adjusted in accordance with the type of blast that follows (*Tosafot*).

אמר אביי: בהא ודאי פליגי, דכתיב: "יום תרועה יהיה לכם" ומתרגמינן: יום יבבא יהא לכוון. וכתיב באימיה דסיסרא "בעד החלון נשקפה ותבבב אם סיסרא". מר סבר: גנוחי גנוח, ומר סבר: ילולי יליל.

Abaye said: In this matter, the *tanna'im* certainly disagree.^N Although the first *baraita* can be reconciled with the mishna, this second *baraita* clearly reflects a dispute. As it is written: "It is a day of sounding [*terua*] the *shofar* to you" (Numbers 29:1), and we translate this verse in Aramaic as: It is a day of *yevava* to you. And to define a *yevava*, the Gemara quotes a verse that is written about the mother of Sisera: "Through the window she looked forth and wailed [*vateyabev*], the mother of Sisera" (Judges 5:28). One Sage, the *tanna* of the *baraita*, holds that this means moanings, broken sighs, as in the blasts called *shevarim*. And one Sage, the *tanna* of the mishna, holds that it means whimpers, as in the short blasts called *teruot*.

תנו רבנן: מנין שבשופר? תלמוד לומר: "והעברת שופר תרועה".

§ The Sages taught in a *baraita*: From where is it derived that the soundings of Rosh HaShana must be performed with a *shofar*? The verse states: "Then you shall make proclamation with the blast of the *shofar* on the tenth day of the seventh month; on the Day of Atonement you shall make proclamation with the *shofar* throughout all your land" (Leviticus 25:9).

אין לי אלא בייבב. בראש השנה מנין? תלמוד לומר: "בחדש השביעי". שאין תלמוד לומר "בחדש השביעי". ומה תלמוד לומר "בחדש השביעי"? שיהיו כל תרועות של חדש שביעי זה בזה.

From this I have derived the *halakha* only with regard to Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year. From where do I derive that the soundings of Rosh HaShana must also be with a *shofar*? The verse states: "Of the seventh month." Since there is no need for the verse to state: "Of the seventh month," as it already states: "On the Day of Atonement," what is the meaning when the verse states: "Of the seventh month"? This comes to teach that all the obligatory soundings of the seventh month must be similar to one another.

ומנין שפשוטה לפניו? תלמוד לומר: "והעברת שופר תרועה". ומנין שפשוטה לאחריה? תלמוד לומר: "תעבירו שופר".

This verse states: "The blast [*terua*] of the *shofar*," indicating that one must sound a *terua*. The Gemara asks: And from where is it derived that the *terua* sound is preceded by a straight blast, i.e., a *tekia*? The verse states: "Then you shall make proclamation with the blast of the *shofar* [*shofar terua*]" (Leviticus 25:9), indicating that the *terua* must be preceded by the basic sound of a *shofar*, i.e., by the straight blast of a *tekia*. And from where is it derived that the *terua* sound is followed by a straight blast? The same verse states again: "You shall make proclamation with the *shofar*," which indicates that there must be another *tekia* after the *terua*.

ואין לי אלא בייבב. בראש השנה מנין? תלמוד לומר: "בחדש השביעי".

The *baraita* continues. From this I have derived the *halakha* only that these *tekia* blasts before and after the *terua* must be sounded on Yom Kippur of the Jubilee Year. From where do I derive that they must be sounded on Rosh HaShana as well? The verse states: "Of the seventh month."

Perek IV
Daf 34 Amud a

שאין תלמוד לומר "בחדש השביעי". ומה תלמוד לומר "בחדש השביעי"? שיהיו כל תרועות החדש השביעי זה - בזה.

Since there is no need for the verse to state: "Of the seventh month," as it already states: "On the Day of Atonement," what is the meaning when the verse states: "Of the seventh month"? This serves to teach that all soundings of the *shofar* of the seventh month must be similar to one another.

ומנין לשלש של שלש? תלמוד לומר: "והעברת שופר תרועה" "שבתון יכרון תרועה" "יום תרועה יהיה לכם".

And from where is it derived that there must be three sets of three blasts each? The verse states: "Then you shall make proclamation with the blast of the *shofar* [*shofar terua*]" (Leviticus 25:9); and another verse states: "A solemn rest, a memorial of blasts [*terua*]" (Leviticus 23:24); and a third verse states: "It is a day of sounding [*terua*] the *shofar* to you" (Numbers 29:1). *Terua* is mentioned three times in these verses, and a *terua* is always preceded and followed by a *tekia*.