Mar Ukva went and asked these questions in the study hall. They said to him: The halakha is: One may fast for hours, and he even prays the prayer of a fast. And the halakha is that the jars belonging to gentiles are permitted after they have not been used at all for twelve months. Finally, in what garments did Moses serve all seven days of inauguration? He did not serve in his own clothes, nor in the regular priestly garments, but in a special white cloak. Rav Kahana taught: Moses served in a white cloak that does not have a hem.

Rav Hisda said:

In a white cloak that does not have a hem [inna] — בְּחָלֻק — according to most early authorities, the term inna is referring to the border of a hem at the bottom of a garment. The white shirt that Moses wore during the seven days of inauguration did not have a border, neither a folded hem nor an additional piece of material sewn to the bottom of the garment. Rashi explains that the shirt was made without a hem so that people could not suspect Moses of illicitly removing money consecrated for the Tabernacle in the folds of his garment. Elsewhere (Avoda Zara 34a), Rashi himself rejects this explanation, arguing that by the time the Tabernacle was inaugurated the money donated for its construction had already been spent. Tosafot (Avoda Zara 34a) suggest that Moses’ shirt was made without a hem so that it would be clear to all that it was new and had never been worn before. Alternatively, this was to prevent people from thinking that some defect had been found in Moses when they saw that he was replaced by Aaron at the end of the seven days of inauguration. Since the shirt that Moses wore lacked a hem, it would be apparent to all that it had been intended from the outset to be worn for only a short time. Tosafot also cite an alternative explanation, that inna means wool. The priestly garments were made of wool and linen, a combination that is ordinarily prohibited as diverse kinds. According to this explanation, Rav Kahana is saying that as the cloak worn by Moses was not a priestly garment, it was made of linen without any admixture of wool.

The halakha is that which you said, that one may fast for a few hours, provided that one took a fast of a few hours upon himself, and that he fasted and did not taste anything until the evening. Abaye said to Rav Hisda: This ruling is obvious, since it is a full-fledged fast, as one ultimately fasts the entire day. Rav Hisda answered: No, it is necessary to say this halakha in a case where he changed his mind, i.e., he began the day without intending to fast, but for various reasons he did not eat, and halfway through the day he decided to continue fasting for another few hours until nightfall. Rav Hisda maintains that this kind of fasting for hours is considered a fast.
A descendant of Sennah, son of the tribe of Benjamin—

According to this version, the Gemara is in fact stating that his family was observant of the Temple during the middle of the day, and the fast is postponed until the Temple were observed by all the members of the family, and the fast is postponed until Sunday, those involved in a yarei veiram day—next day to rectify the dream’s bad e-

The Gemara cites another proof: Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Tzadok, said: I am a descendant of Sennah, son of the tribe of Benjamin, and once the Ninth of Av occurred on Shabbat, and we postponed the fast until after Shabbat, as Shabbat supersedes the fast of the Ninth of Av. And we fasted on that day, but we did not complete the fast, due to the fact that the tenth of Av is a holiday of ours, a private holiday for our family (26a), and one does not fast on holidays. This proves that a fast of only a few hours is never called a fast. The Gemara rejects this claim: There too, they did so merely to cause themselves distress.

To excuse himself from the household of the Nasi—ויְקֵחֵץ מִבֵּית נָסִי: It is inferred in the Jerusalem Talmud (Nedarim 8:8) from a similar statement of Rabbi Yohanan that one may commit to fast for a period of hours or until a certain event occurs. Apparently, the Gemara there understands that Rabbi Yohanan did indeed commit to fast for several hours, and that one who obligates himself to fast in the morning and eats in the afternoon is considered to have observed a fast. This ruling contradicts the opinion of Rav Hisdai cited here. Some early authorities attempt to reconcile the opinions of the two passages (see Ritva and Meiri).

Any fast that one did not take upon himself⁴ while it was still day⁵ is not called a fast. The Gemara asks: And if one happened to sit in observance of a fast that day, what is that considered? Rabbi Bar Shemuel said: He is likened to a bellows that is full of air. His behavior does not constitute a fast, as he is merely a container full of air, without food.

And Rav Hisdai said: Any fast⁶ upon which the sun does not set, i.e., when one eats in the middle of the day, it is not called a fast at all. The Gemara raises an objection: The members of the priestly watch, the priests and Levites who are serving in the Temple that week, fast on a communal fast, like the members of the non-priestly watch who are attached to specific groups of priests, but they do not complete the fast with the rest of the community. This indicates that even a fast lasting only a few hours is called a fast. The Gemara explains: There they abstained from food merely to cause themselves distress, as an act of solidarity with the rest of the community, but this was not considered a full-fledged fast.

The early authorities point out a difficulty. As Rav Hisdai’s first ruling, that one who fasts for hours may not taste anything until evening, is apparently identical to his second statement, that a fast that does not continue until sunset is not considered a fast, one of these statements is apparently superfluous. This difficulty is removed if the reading of Rabbinnei Hananel and others is accepted: And Rav Hisdai follows his own reasoning. According to this version, the Gemara is in fact stating that his family was observant of the Temple during the middle of the day, and the fast is postponed until Sunday, those involved in a yarei veiram day—next day to rectify the dream’s bad e-

And Rav Hisdai said: Any fast⁶ upon which the sun does not set, i.e., when one eats in the middle of the day, it is not called a fast at all. The Gemara raises an objection: The members of the priestly watch, the priests and Levites who are serving in the Temple that week, fast on a communal fast, like the members of the non-priestly watch who are attached to specific groups of priests, but they do not complete the fast with the rest of the community. This indicates that even a fast lasting only a few hours is called a fast. The Gemara explains: There they abstained from food merely to cause themselves distress, as an act of solidarity with the rest of the community, but this was not considered a full-fledged fast.

The Gemara cites another proof: Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Tzadok, said: I am a descendant of Sennah, son of the tribe of Benjamin, and once the Ninth of Av occurred on Shabbat, and we postponed the fast until after Shabbat, as Shabbat supersedes the fast of the Ninth of Av. And we fasted on that day, but we did not complete the fast, due to the fact that the tenth of Av is a holiday of ours, a private holiday for our family (26a), and one does not fast on holidays. This proves that a fast of only a few hours is never called a fast. The Gemara rejects this claim: There too, they did so merely to cause themselves distress.

The Gemara again attempts to disprove the opinion of Rav Hisdai, this time by citing a custom of Rabbi Yohanan: Come and hear, as Rabbi Yohanan occasionally said: I shall be in observance of a fast until I come to my house. This indicates that one can take a fast upon himself even for just a few hours. The Gemara rejects this proof as well: There he did this to excuse himself from the household of the Nasi. At times, Rabbi Yohanan received an invitation to dine at the house of the Nasi, but wanted to decline. To avoid insulting the Nasi, he would say that he had taken a fast upon himself, and afterward he would eat at home. Since this was not a real fast, it is not proof of the legitimacy of a partial-day fast.

Shmuel said: Any fast that one did not take upon himself⁴ while it was still day⁵ is not called a fast. The Gemara asks: And if one happened to sit in observance of a fast that day, what is that considered? Rabbi Bar Shemuel said: He is likened to a bellows that is full of air. His behavior does not constitute a fast, as he is merely a container full of air, without food.
In the afternoon – יום החלה: Most early authorities explain that according to the opinion of Rav one who wishes to observe an individual fast is required to take that fast upon himself at some point during the previous afternoon. Rav Hai Gaon states that one must commit to the fast during the second half of the day, from the time of mincha gedolah, the earlier afternoon prayer, which begins half an hour after midday. Conversely, Rabbeinu Gershon maintains that one must commit to the fast during the final quarter of the day, from the start of mincha ketona, the later afternoon prayer, nine and a half hours after sunrise.

According to some early authorities, Rav says that one must commit to the fast during the afternoon only to emphasize the difference between his opinion and that of Shmuel, who rules that this must be performed during the afternoon prayer. In fact, Rav maintains that one who wishes to observe an individual fast may take it upon himself well in advance (Ritva; Ran). These commentaries explain the dispute between Rav and Shmuel as follows: According to Rav, the undertaking of a fast is considered a vow to perform a meritorious deed. This vow is binding even if it is uttered well in advance. Shmuel, however, argues that one who undertakes to observe a fast is not vowing to perform a meritorious deed, as his vow will cause him suffering. Consequently, he must take on the fast in the manner in which one accepts Shabbat or a festival, i.e., in the prayer he recites shortly before the onset of the fast.

At the afternoon prayer –_Prayer ברכות: The early authorities dispute the precise formula of the prayer that signifies taking on a fast, as well as the point in the afternoon when it is recited. According to the Rambam, one who wishes to observe an individual fast must recite the special Aneinu prayer in the sixteenth blessing of the afternoon Amidah the day before the fast (see Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Taanit 1:10 and Maggid Mishne there). Many authorities reject this view, arguing that the sources indicate that the Aneinu prayer is recited only on a fast day itself. The Rambam himself apparently changed his opinion, as this ruling does not appear in the standard version of his code.

Most early authorities maintain that a fast must be taken on by reciting the formula: Tomorrow I will observe an individual fast. According to some commentaries, this formula is included in the sixteenth blessing of the afternoon Amidah. Others claim that it is inserted at the end of the Amidah, immediately before the last line: May the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart find favor before You, or immediately after that line, before one takes the three steps backward that signal the conclusion of the Amidah prayer.

What is it not the case that he binds himself at the time of prayer – אֵי מַאי מָדַבֵּר אִינִי? Some commentaries ask how the reading: He binds himself, supports the opinion of Shmuel. Even Rav agrees that one who wishes to observe a fast must obligate himself beforehand. Rav can simply explain that one must commit himself at some point during the afternoon before his proposed fast (Ritva).

The Ritva answers that Rav maintains that one is not required to commit to his proposed fast in the afternoon prayer, because he holds that committing to a fast constitutes a vow to perform a meritorious deed. Consequently, it also follows that it is not necessary for him to declare that he is taking the fast on the previous day at all. Instead, he can commit to the fast well in advance, in which case there would be no need for him to mention the fast once again the day before. For this reason, the Gemara claims that this section of Megillat Taanit is not in accordance with the opinion of Rav. The Gemara answers that the text must be amended to read: He shall render himself prohibited. This means that if one has taken a fast upon himself beforehand, he may not eat on that day, even if it occurs on a day when fasting is prohibited.
An individual who took upon himself to fast on Monday, Thursday, and Monday – according to the Sages, this is raliyot, but according to Rabbi Shimon, this is teshuvah. If an individual committed himself to a series of fasts, and one of the days on which he was supposed to fast occurs on a Shabbat, a Festival, a New Moon, Hanukkah, or Purim, then the following halakha applies: If he took on the fasts by means of the ordinary formula, he is not required to fast on those days; however, if he took on the fasts in the form of a vow, his vow is binding and requires annulment (Ramban). The Rambam maintains that if one took the fasts on himself by means of a vow, and one of the days on which he is supposed to fast occurs on a date when fasting is prohibited by Torah law, the vow is binding and requires annulment. Conversely, if that day occurs on Hanukkah or Purim, on which fasting is prohibited by rabbinic decree, the vow is not binding. The accepted custom is in accordance with the opinion of the Rambam (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 570:1, and in the comment of Rema).

Until when may one eat and drink – and one of the days on which he was supposed to fast occurs on a date when fasting is prohibited by Torah law, the vow is binding and requires annulment. Conversely, if that day occurs on Hanukkah or Purim, on which fasting is prohibited by rabbinic decree, the vow is not binding. The accepted custom is in accordance with the opinion of the Rambam (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 570:1, and in the comment of Rema).

On any fast that is observed only during the daytime, whether it is an individual or a communal fast, one may eat and drink all night until dawn, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. However, if one falls soundly asleep, he may not eat when he wakes up, unless he stipulated beforehand that he will eat in the event that he awakens. If he merely dozes off, he is permitted to eat until morning. Some authorities maintain that one may drink until morning, even if he falls into a sound sleep without stipulating that he will drink when he wakes up, as he certainly had in mind that he should be permitted to drink until the fast begins (Rema, citing Mordekhai and Tur). Some authorities maintain that it is nevertheless preferable to explicitly make a stipulation with regard to drinking as well (Magen Avraham). Others argue that nowadays, when all are accustomed to drinking upon awakening, this stipulation is not necessary (Avukh HaShulhan, Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 570:1).

The Gemara explains: This is as it is taught in Megillat Ta'anit: Whoever has taken upon himself beforehand to fast on one of these Festivals days, he will be prohibited to eat and drink. How so? With regard to an individual who took upon himself to fast on each Monday, Thursday, and Monday series of the entire year, and the commemorative holidays written in Megillat Ta’anit occurred on these days, if his vow preceded our decree, i.e., the decree of the Sages establishing these commemorative days, his vow annuls our decree and he must fast, but if our decree preceded his vow, our decree annuls his vow and he may not fast on those days.

The Sages taught in a baraita: Until when may one eat and drink on communal fasts, when one fasts during the day but not the preceding evening? Until dawn. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: Until the call of the rooster, which is before dawn. Abaye said: They taught this ruling, that one may eat all night, only if he has not finished his evening meal, as he may continue eating the same meal all night. However, if he has finished his meal, he may not eat any more.

Rava raised an objection to Abaye from a baraita: If one finished his meal and stood up, nevertheless, he may eat more. This shows that one may in fact eat throughout the night, even if he has finished his meal. Abaye answered: There the baraita is referring to a situation where he has not yet removed or cleared the table, and therefore it is as though he has not yet finished his meal. Some say a slightly different version of this discussion. Rava said: They taught this ruling only if he did not sleep after eating, but if he slept he may not eat anything else that night. Abaye raised an objection to Rava from a baraita: If one slept and arose from his sleep during the night, he may eat. Rava explained: There the baraita is referring to one who was merely dozing, and was not fully asleep.

The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of dozing? Rav Ashi said:

If his vow preceded our decree – and one of the days on which he was supposed to fast occurs on a date when fasting is prohibited by Torah law, the vow is binding and requires annulment. Conversely, if that day occurs on Hanukkah or Purim, on which fasting is prohibited by rabbinic decree, the vow is not binding. The early authorities suggest several interpretations of this passage. Rashi and many other early commentaries explain that this refers to the time when the Sages first instituted the commemorative days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit. If the vow preceded that decree, it is valid, but if the decree preceded the vow, the fast is annulled.

Others understand the Gemara differently. In a case in which one has committed himself to a series of fasts, if he has already observed one or more of them and the next fast falls on a day recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, then his vow overrules the decree of the Sages. However, if he has not yet observed any of his fasts, and the first of the series falls on a commemorative day listed in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow, and it is prohibited for him to fast (Ravad on Rf). Yet others explain that if one undertook a series of fasts before the rabbinical court sanctified the New Moon, in which case he could not have known when he vowed that his fasts would fall on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, his vow overrules the Sages’ decree. Conversely, if one vowed after the court had already sanctified the New Moon, so that he should have known that his fasts would occur on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow (Rabbeinu Gershom).

If his vow preceded our decree – Rav Ashi said: The early authorities suggest several interpretations of this passage. Rashi and many other early commentaries explain that this refers to the time when the Sages first instituted the commemorative days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit. If the vow preceded that decree, it is valid, but if the decree preceded the vow, the fast is annulled.

Others understand the Gemara differently. In a case in which one has committed himself to a series of fasts, if he has already observed one or more of them and the next fast falls on a day recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, then his vow overrules the decree of the Sages. However, if he has not yet observed any of his fasts, and the first of the series falls on a commemorative day listed in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow, and it is prohibited for him to fast (Ravad on Rf).

Yet others explain that if one undertook a series of fasts before the rabbinical court sanctified the New Moon, in which case he could not have known when he vowed that his fasts would fall on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, his vow overrules the Sages’ decree. Conversely, if one vowed after the court had already sanctified the New Moon, so that he should have known that his fasts would occur on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow (Rabbeinu Gershom).

If his vow preceded our decree – Rav Ashi said:

If his vow preceded our decree – Rav Ashi said: The early authorities suggest several interpretations of this passage. Rashi and many other early commentaries explain that this refers to the time when the Sages first instituted the commemorative days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit. If the vow preceded that decree, it is valid, but if the decree preceded the vow, the fast is annulled.

Others understand the Gemara differently. In a case in which one has committed himself to a series of fasts, if he has already observed one or more of them and the next fast falls on a day recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, then his vow overrules the decree of the Sages. However, if he has not yet observed any of his fasts, and the first of the series falls on a commemorative day listed in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow, and it is prohibited for him to fast (Ravad on Rf). Yet others explain that if one undertook a series of fasts before the rabbinical court sanctified the New Moon, in which case he could not have known when he vowed that his fasts would fall on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, his vow overrules the Sages’ decree. Conversely, if one vowed after the court had already sanctified the New Moon, so that he should have known that his fasts would occur on days recorded in Megillat Ta’anit, the decree of the Sages cancels his vow (Rabbeinu Gershom).

Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon – Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, was a distinguished scholar, like his father, Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai. Rabbi Elazar’s remarkable personality is the subject of numerous anecdotes. When Rabbi Shimon bar Yohai, who was strongly opposed to Roman rule, was betrayed to the authorities by informers, Rabbi Elazar fled with his father and lived with him in a cave for thirteen years. The two subsisted on the barest essentials and spent their time studying Torah. During this period, Rabbi Elazar learned almost everything he knew from his father, who was his principal teacher, though Rabbi Elazar occasionally disagreed with his halakhic rulings. Rabbi Elazar also studied with other scholars of his father’s generation, including Rabbi Yehuda, Rabbi Elazar ben Shammai, and Rabbi Meir.

Later, Rabbi Elazar was forced to assume the unpopular position of a law-enforcement officer, and his acceptance of the post aroused opposition among the Sages. His spiritual independence led to friction with other Sages, which cooled his relations with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, a friend from his youth. Nevertheless, all acknowledged his personal piety, asceticism, and greatness in Torah knowledge. His father considered him one of the most pious individuals of all time, and he was apparently considered exceptionally righteous by the common people as well. Rabbi Elazar is also one of the most prominent figures in the Zohar. When he died, he was eulogized for his great achievements as a student of the Torah, both Written and Oral, as a preacher, and as a composer of liturgical poetry. The Gemara informs us that he was buried next to his father’s grave in Meron.

Rabbi Elazar’s teachings are quoted explicitly in several places in the Mishna, while many other rulings of his are apparently stated in the Mishna anonymously. He was therefore referred to as Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, The Unattributed, i.e., the one whose opinions are often recorded as unattributed mishnayot. Some of his statements, which are also quoted by early amoraim, are cited in the Tosefta and in halakhic midrash.
The Gemara relates: The Sages said to Rav Sheshet, who was blind: We see Sages who wear their shoes and go to the study house on a communal fast day. This shows that there is no need to be concerned about this prohibition. Rav Sheshet became angry and said to them: Perhaps they even ate, if you saw them treating the fast lightly.

The Gemara further relates: Abaye and Rava would enter the synagogue while wearing sandals on the leather [apanta] of their shoes, i.e., they would wear their shoes upside down. Mareimar and Mar Zutra would switch the right shoe for the left and the left for the right. By contrast, the Sages of the school of Rav Ashi would go out wearing shoes in their usual manner. They hold in accordance with that which Shmuel said: The only completely stringent communal fast in Babylonia is the Ninth of Av alone. Therefore, in Babylonia there is no need to be concerned that one might have taken a communal fast upon himself.

The Gemara discusses another topic related to fasts. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: A person may borrow his fast and repay.41 i.e., if one is unable to fast on the specific day he intended to fast, he may annul his fast for that day and fast on another day instead. Rav Yehuda related: When I said this halakha before Shmuel, he said to me: And did he take a vow upon himself, which would mean that it is not possible for him not to repay it? He took upon himself to cause himself discomfort on that day. If he is able, he must cause himself discomfort; if he is unable, he does not need to cause himself discomfort, in which case he need not repay the fast.

Some say a different version of this discussion. Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: One may borrow his fast and repay. When I said this halakha before Shmuel, he said to me: This is obvious. Let it be considered only a vow; even so, is he not required to repay a vow on the next day or on another day? Since a commitment to fast is a type of vow, he is obligated to repay it at some point in time.

PERSONALITIES

Mareimar – מאריימר: A Babylonian amora of the sixth generation, Mareimar was a colleague of Rav Ashi. After Rav Ashi's death, Mareimar is said to have taken his place as head of the Sura academy. Many Sages of the following generation were his students, especially Ravina the younger, his closest disciple. The prefix Mar is possibly an indication that he belonged to the family of the Exilarch. Mareimar's son, Rav Yehuda bar Mareimar, was also a Sage.

Mar Zutra – מאר צטרה: A colleague of Rav Ashi, Mar Zutra was one of the leading Sages of his generation. His teachers Rav Pappa and Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak accepted him as their equal. Apart from his greatness in halakho and aggada, Mar Zutra was a noted preacher, and his sermons are cited in the Gemara. He apparently held an official position as scholar-in-residence and preacher in the household of the Exilarch. In his old age, he was appointed head of the Pumbedita academy.

Some of the meetings between Mar Zutra, Ameimar, and Rav Ashi, which are frequently mentioned in the Talmud, may well have been formal conferences attended by the leaders of Babylonian Jewry.

A person may borrow his fast and repay – A person may borrow his fast and repay. If one vowed to observe a fast on a particular day, but forgot his vow and ate on that day, he must refrain from eating for the remainder of the day. However, if he vowed to fast without specifying a particular date, and after beginning to fast he forgot and ate, he is required to fast on another day. If one vowed to observe several fasts without specifying the dates, and after starting to fast on a particular day he wants to cancel the fast on account of some other religious obligation, or in honor of an important person, or because he was in a state of distress (Rena), he is permitted to break his fast and repay it on another day (Shulchan Arukh, Orach HaYyim 568:1–2).

HALAKHA

The leather [apanta] – חפירה: The piece of leather on the portion of a shoe that covers the foot. In Syriac, panta means the back of the hand, or the skin covering the foot.

While wearing sandals on the leather [apanta] – בפanta. The early authorities dispute the precise meaning of the term apanta, although they all apparently agree that this is referring to a type of shoe that does not have leather soles. Tosafot maintain that apanta is referring to a type of footwear consisting only of the upper portion of a shoe, without a sole. Rashi and the Shita Meikubetzer explain that apanta is a soft slipper. Others claim that these turned their shoes upside down and walked with their feet touching the soles.

A person may borrow his fast and repay – A person may borrow his fast and repay. According to the Rambam (Sefer HaHada’ot, Hilchot Nedarim 4:15) and several other early authorities, this applies only if one did not specify the date for his fast. However, if he undertook to observe a fast on a specific day, he cannot later transfer his fast to a different date. Conversely, most early authorities maintain that this halakha applies even if one undertook to observe a fast on a specific day (Halawa, Rashba, Rina). They argue that support for this opinion is provided by the anecdote cited in the Gemara involving Rav Yehoshua, son of Rav I. When Rav Yehoshua explained that he was declining to eat due to his fast, the members of Rav Asî’s household suggested that he observe the fast on some other day, without first asking him whether he had specified a particular day.

The early authorities also disagree with regard to the circumstances in which one may cancel his fast and observe it on another day. Some maintain that this halakha applies only if he would suffer great distress were he to continue fasting (Rabbeinu Hananel). Others rule that it also applies if he is invited to a meal that can be characterized as a religious celebration, or if he wants to participate in a meal as a mark of honor to an important person, or to maintain good social relations with his friends (R. Rambam). Yet others claim that the story of Rav Yehoshua, son of Rav I, proves that one may postpone his fast even if he cannot provide any special reason for doing so.
A third-born (titla) calf – אֲמַרְתָּא תִילְתָּא. Some commentators on Shabbat 11a explain that titla is referring to a calf that reached only a third of its potential size; such a calf has the choicest meat (Rashi). Others say that meshulash in the Bible and titla here both mean the best, similar to the term “and captains [shulshim] over them all” (Exodus 14:2), which is referring to the highest ranking soldiers (Tosafot in Shabbat 11a).

A fast for a dream – מִדֵי לַחֲלוֹם. This issue of observing a fast for a troubling dream is discussed at length by the commentators, especially in light of the statement of the Gemara elsewhere (Sanhedrin 30a) that dreams do not have any particular significance (Ritva). The Ritva explains that one who has experienced a disturbing dream should take it as a sign from Heaven to examine his ways and repent. Observing a fast is an act that facilitates sincere repentance. The fast should be observed on the day following the dream, even on Shabbat, while the dream is still vivid and likely to lead to repentance. Ordinarily, the obligation to experience joy and pleasure on Shabbat renders it prohibited to fast. However, one who has experienced a disturbing dream is permitted to fast on Shabbat, as he would not enjoy his food anyway. On the contrary, he takes pleasure in fasting, as in this manner he can begin to mend his ways and lessen the anxiety caused by the dream.

And even on Shabbat – אַבָּא וּבְסִיכָה. Some commentators explain that this incident involving Rav Yehoshua, son of Rav Yirmeya, occurred on a Shabbat, which is why a third-born calf was prepared for him. This explains the need for him to specify that he was fasting for a bad dream, which is permitted even on Shabbat (Rambam Shnuer).

**MISHNA**

If these three regular fasts have passed and they have not been answered with rain, the court decrees three other fasts upon the community. These are severe fasts, in which one may eat and drink only while it is still day, before the beginning of the night of the fast, and on the day of the fast itself they are prohibited to engage in the performance of work, in bathing, in smearing with oil, in wearing shoes, and in marital relations; and they lock the bathhouses so that no one should come to bathe on that day.

If these three fasts have passed and they still have not been answered, the court decrees on them another seven fasts, which are a total of thirteen fasts, upon the community, not including the first three fasts observed by individuals. These seven fast days are more severe than the first ones, as on these days, in addition to all the earlier stringencies, they sound the alarm, as will be explained in the Gemara, and they lock the stores. Although shops must remain closed most of the time on these days, on Monday they open them a little at nightfall to allow people to purchase food for breaking their fast, and on Thursday they are permitted to open the stores all day in deference to Shabbat, so that people may purchase food for the sacred day.

If these fasts have passed and they have not been answered the court does not decree additional fasts, but the entire community observes the customs of mourning. They decrease their engagement in business transactions, in building and planting, in betrothals and marriages, and in greetings between each person and his fellow, like people who have been rebuked by God. The individuals, i.e., Torah scholars, resume fasting every Monday and Thursday until the middle of Nisan ends. After this date they no longer pray for rain, since if Nisan has ended and rains subsequently fall, they are a sign of a curse, as it is stated: “Is not the wheat harvest today? I will call to the Lord that He may send thunder and rain, and you will know and see that your wickedness is great” (1 Samuel 12:17). The wheat harvest is around the time of Shavuot, well after Nisan.

**GEMARA**

The Gemara discusses the activities that are prohibited on a communal fast day: Granted, all of the other actions are prohibited, as they provide pleasure, namely, bathing, smearing, and marital relations. However, working is a cause of suffering. Why was it decreed that one must refrain from working? Rav Hisda said that Rav Yirmeya bar Abba said as that the verse states: “Sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders” (Joel 1:14), this indicates that a fast day is like a day of assembly. Just as on a day of assembly, i.e., a Festival, it is prohibited to engage in working, so too, on a fast it is prohibited to engage in working.
The Gemara asks: How do they act on a fast day? Abaye said: From the morning until the middle of the day (ד.RequestMapping the townspeople. They attempt to rectify any problems or correct the wrongs committed in their community as a whole may have inflicted on individuals (Rabbi Elyakim).

Halakha

From the morning until the middle of the day – נמי. On communal fast days that are decreed to avert an impending calamity, the court judges and the community leaders gather in the synagogues from after the completion of the morning prayers until noon, to examine the conduct of the townspeople. They attempt to rectify any flaws in behavior that they might find, and they admonish wrongdoers and shame those who resort to violence to get their way. During the third quarter of the day, however, an appropriate section of the Torah is read, as well as a portion from the Prophets related to the occasion. During the last quarter of the day, the congregation recites the afternoon prayer and offers special petitions and supplications. These practices have not been observed in recent generations, either because the courts no longer have the authority to correct the wrongs they find (Arukh HaShulhan), or because in general the customs concerning communal fasts are no longer observed in their entirety (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 576:16).

I can reverse – נמי אוי. Although it stands to reason that the members of a community should first correct their ways and only afterward petition for mercy, the Gemara argues that there is good reason to reverse the order, as many of the halakhot of fasting and repentance are derived from the description of the penitence of the people of Nineveh. The Rambam Shmuel points out that the book of Jonah states that the inhabitants of Nineveh first petitioned God for mercy and only then attended to the wrongs committed in their community: “But let them be covered with sackcloth, both man and beast, and let them cry mightily to God; and let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands” (Jonah 3:8). Then were assembled to me, etc. – נמי אוי. In other words, all those who feared God came to discuss “the faithlessness of the captivity,” i.e., the sins of the people of the Babylonian captivity who had ascended to Eretz Yisrael. This is referring to the correction of communal wrongs, as stated in the previous halakha (Rabbi Elyakim, Ran).