

אֶלָּא בְּרֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה, וּבְיָבֻלֹת, וּבְשַׁעַת מַלְחָמָה.

”עַל הַרְאֵשׁוֹנָה הוּא אוֹמֵר: מִי שֶׁעָנָה אֶת אַבְרָהָם, כּוּ. תִּנָּא: יֵשׁ מַחְלִיפִין צָעֲקָה לְאַלְיָהוּ וְתַפְלָה לְשִׁמּוּאֵל. בְּשִׁלְמָא גַבֵּי שְׁמוּאֵל כְּתִיב בֵּיהּ תַּפְלָה וְכְתִיב בֵּיהּ צָעֲקָה.

אֶלָּא גַבֵּי אֲלֵיָהוּ תַּפְלָה כְּתִיב, צָעֲקָה לָא כְּתִיב! ”עַנְנִי, ה', עַנְנִי” לְשׁוֹן צָעֲקָה הִיא.

”עַל הַשְּׁשִׁית הוּא אוֹמֵר: מִי שֶׁעָנָה אֶת יוֹנָה, כּוּ. ”עַל הַשְּׁבִיעִית הוּא אוֹמֵר: מִי שֶׁעָנָה אֶת דָּוִד, כּוּ. מִכְּדֵי יוֹנָה בְּתֵר דָּוִד וְשִׁלְמָה הָיָה, מֵאִי טַעֲמָא מְקַדִּים לֵיהּ בְּרִישָׁא? מְשׁוּם דְּבַעֵי לְמִיחְתָּם: מְרַחֵם עַל הָאָרֶץ. תִּנָּא: מְשׁוּם סוּמְכּוּס אָמְרוּ: בְּרוּךְ מְשַׁפֵּיל הָרְמִים.

”שְׁלֹשׁ תַּעֲנִיּוֹת הָרֵאשׁוֹנוֹת, אֲנָשֵׁי מְשַׁמֵּר מִתְעַנִּין וְלֹא מְשַׁלְּמִין” כּוּ. תִּנּוּ רַבְנֵי: מִפְּנֵי מַה אָמְרוּ אֲנָשֵׁי מְשַׁמֵּר מוֹתְרִין לְשִׁתּוֹת זֵין בְּלֵילוֹת, אֲבָל לֹא בִּימִים? שְׂמָא תְּקַבֵּד הַעֲבוּדָה עַל אֲנָשֵׁי בֵּית אָב, וְיָבֹאוּ וְיִסְיְעוּ לָהֶם.

only on Rosh HaShana, and on Yom Kippur of Jubilee Years, and in a time of war.

§ The mishna teaches: **For the first blessing he recites: He Who answered Abraham.** It was taught in a *baraita*: **Some reverse the order of the conclusion of two blessings, by reciting: Who hears cries, in the fifth blessing, which deals with Elijah, and the conclusion: Who hears prayer, in the blessing of Samuel.** The Gemara asks: **Granted, with regard to Samuel both options are appropriate, as it is written concerning him: Prayer, and it is likewise written concerning him: Crying.** One verse states: “And Samuel said: Gather all of Israel to Mizpah, and I will pray for you to the Lord” (1 Samuel 7:5), while another verse states: “And Samuel cried to the Lord for Israel” (1 Samuel 7:9).

However, with regard to Elijah, although prayer is written, as it says: “Elijah the prophet came near and said: Lord, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel” (1 Kings 18:36), which is referring to a prayer, **crying is not written.** How, then, can one conclude a blessing that deals with Elijah by mentioning crying? The Gemara answers that Elijah’s statement: “**Answer me, Lord, answer me**” (1 Kings 18:37), is an expression of crying, even if the term crying does not itself actually appear.

§ The mishna further teaches: **For the sixth he recites: He Who answered Jonah; for the seventh he recites: He Who answered David.** The Gemara asks: **Since Jonah was after David^N and Solomon, what is the reason that the *tanna* mentions Jonah first?** The Gemara answers: The reason is **due to the fact that he wants to conclude the series with: Blessed are You, Lord, Who has mercy on the Land.** Therefore, the last blessing mentions David and Solomon, who were kings of Eretz Yisrael and prayed on its behalf. It was taught in the name of Sumakhos^L that they said he concludes the final blessing with: **Blessed are You, Lord, Who humbles the exalted.**^N

§ The mishna teaches that on the first three fasts, the members of the priestly watch fast but do not complete their fasts until nightfall. The mishna then proceeds to cite other *halakhot* that deal with the members of the priestly watch and the patrilineal family. **The Sages taught: For what reason did they say that the members of the priestly watch are permitted to drink wine at nights but not during the days?**^H They said this lest on a certain day the Temple service becomes burdensome for the members of the patrilineal family, and the members of the priestly watch are called to come and assist them. Therefore, it is prohibited for them to drink wine during the day, when their help might be needed, so that they do not enter the Temple after drinking wine.

LANGUAGE

Sumakhos – סוּמְכּוּס: From the Greek σύμμαχος, *sumakhos*, meaning an ally.

HALAKHA

At nights but not during the days – בְּלֵילוֹת אֲבָל לֹא – בִּימִים: It is permitted for the members of the priestly watch whose week it is to serve in the Temple to drink wine at night, but not during the day. It is prohibited for the members of the patrilineal family who are responsible for the Temple service that day to drink wine both during the day and during the night (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:6).

NOTES

Since Jonah was after David – מִכְּדֵי יוֹנָה בְּתֵר דָּוִד: The Gemara could equally have asked why Elijah is mentioned before David and Solomon, as he too preceded them (see Maharsha). In the Jerusalem Talmud this question is indeed raised with regard to Elijah, and a similar answer is given as to the inquiry concerning Jonah.

Blessed are You, Lord, Who humbles the exalted – בְּרוּךְ מְשַׁפֵּיל הָרְמִים: The early authorities discuss the connection between this concluding formula and David and Solomon. Some commentaries explain that both David and Solomon grew overly proud (Ritva, citing Jerusalem Talmud). David’s pride led him to conduct a census of the nation against the advice of his counselor (1 Samuel 24:2–4), and Solomon glorified in his achievement of building the Temple

(1 Kings 8:13). Both of them were subsequently humbled by God, after which they repented and their prayers were answered. This blessing expresses the hope that just as the repentance of David and Solomon was accepted by God, so will the repentance of those who are fasting be accepted, and the calamity threatening the community will be averted.

Others explain this concluding formula in a very different manner. During the reigns of David and Solomon the elevated were humbled, i.e., the nations of the world became subjugated to the Jewish people. Therefore, the series of special blessings recited on account of drought concludes with a general expression of praise to God (*Shita Mekubetzet*). A variant reading, cited by several early authorities, states: Blessed are You, Lord, Who humbles and exalts.

The members of the patrilineal family neither by day nor by night – **לא ביום ולא בלילה**: Most early authorities explain that it is prohibited for the members of the patrilineal family whose turn it is to serve in the Temple to drink wine, not only during the day but also at night, as certain tasks, e.g., the burning of fats and limbs, are carried out at night as well as by day.

Others explain that they may not drink wine at night, lest they rise early in the morning and begin to serve in the Temple before they are entirely sober, thereby violating the prohibition against performing the Temple service in a state of intoxication (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:6).

It has been noted that there is a practical difference between these two explanations: According to the Rambam, it is prohibited for the members of a patrilineal family to drink wine on the night prior to their service in the Temple, whereas according to the other early commentaries they may not drink wine on the night following the day on which they perform their service (*Hasdei David*).

כל כהן שפיקדו משמרתו – Any priest who knows his priestly watch – Rashi and many other early commentaries maintain that the *baraita* is referring to the period after the destruction of the Temple. Although the Temple is no longer standing, those priests who know that they belong to a certain watch or a patrilineal family are required to abstain from wine at certain times, so that they will be ready to serve if the Temple is suddenly rebuilt. Others indicate that the *baraita* is dealing with the period when the Temple was still standing. During that time, even if a priest was abroad or could not serve in the Temple for some other reason, he was required to abstain from wine during the day or week of the service of his watch or patrilineal family (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:7; see *Gevurat Ari* and *Sefat Emet*).

שפיקדו משמרתו – That the family of his forefathers was established there – Rashi explains that the priest knows that his family was fit to serve in the Temple, as they were never disqualified from participating in the Temple service on account of the personal status of one of the family's ancestors (Rashi).

Some early commentaries explain that there were priests who were not assigned to a particular watch and consequently did not have a set time to serve in the Temple. Rather, they would come to the Temple whenever they wished, and they would assist the members of the watch on duty at the time. According to this interpretation, the expression: He knows that the family of his forefathers was established there, means that he is aware that his family had been attached to a particular priestly watch that had a fixed time to serve in the Temple (see Rambam on *Sefer HaMitzvot*, positive mitzva 36; Ritva).

אם כהן שפיקדו משמרתו – **שפיקדו משמרתו**: Several interpretations have been offered for this expression. Some explain that the fact that the Temple has been destroyed works to the advantage of the priests, as there is no reason to require them to abstain from wine when there is no Temple and no service (*ge'onim*). Rashi and others suggest a slight variation of this interpretation, according to which the misfortune refers to the future, not the present: The fact that the Temple has lain in its ruined state for such a long time benefits the priests, as it is apparently unlikely that it will be rebuilt in the immediate future. Therefore, the restrictions against drinking wine that were once imposed on the priests have been suspended.

Others explain that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's comment applies only in the case of a priest who does not know to which priestly watch and patrilineal family he belongs. This priest is permitted to drink wine whenever he wants, as he cannot serve in the Temple until his watch and patrilineal family have been determined. Consequently, the priest's misfortune, i.e., his ignorance, is to his advantage (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:7).

Yet others state an entirely different explanation: It should be prohibited permanently for all priests to drink wine, but this enactment would lead to their downfall, as they would not be able to observe the prohibition. It is therefore preferable to permit them to drink wine, so that they not willfully violate a prohibition (*Mikhtam; Kaftor VaFerah*).

שפיקדו משמרתו – **שפיקדו משמרתו**: Some commentaries ask: Since priests are required to cut their hair at least once every thirty days, as stated in the Gemara below, in any case the hair of the priests entering their watch will not be overly long (Ra'avad). Nevertheless, if a priest enters his watch without first trimming his hair, his hair will be somewhat long, even if he has cut it within the last thirty days (Rosh).

מפני מה אמרו אנשי בית אב לא ביום ולא בלילה? מפני שהן עסקין תמיד בעבודה.

מכאן אמרו: כל כהן שפיקדו משמרתו ומשמרתו בית אב שלו, ויודע שפיקדו אבותיו קבועין שם, אסור לשנותו יום כל אותו היום. במכיר משמרתו ואין מכיר משמרתו בית אב שלו, ויודע שפיקדו אבותיו קבועין שם, אסור לשנותו יום כל אותה שבת.

אינו מכיר משמרתו ומשמרתו בית אב שלו, ויודע שפיקדו אבותיו קבועין שם, אסור לשנותו יום כל השנה.

רבי אומר: אומר אני: אסור לשנותו יום לעולם. אבל מה אעשה? שתקנתו קלקלתו? אמר רבי: במאן שתו האידינא כהני חמרא? כרבי.

“אנשי משמר ואנשי מעמד אסורים לספור ולכבס. ובחמישי מותרין מפני כבוד השבת.” מאי טעמא? אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: כדי שלא יכנסו למשמרתם בשנה מנוולין.

The *baraita* continues to explain the reason for the mishna's ruling. For what reason did they say that the members of the patrilineal family may not drink wine, neither by day nor by night?^N Because they are constantly engaged in the Temple service.

From here the Sages stated: Even nowadays, after the destruction of the Temple, with regard to any priest who knows his priestly watch,^N in which his family served, and the watch of his patrilineal family, and he knows that the family of his forefathers was established as fit for the Temple service there,^N it is prohibited for him to drink wine that entire day, in the event that the Temple is rebuilt on that day and he will be called to return to the service. In the case of a priest who knows his priestly watch, i.e., the week of the year in which his family served, and does not know the watch of his patrilineal family, the day of the week that his family served, but he knows that the family of his forefathers was established there, it is prohibited for him to drink wine that entire week.

Finally, if he does not know his priestly watch or the watch of his patrilineal family, but he knows that the family of his forefathers was established there, he is prohibited to drink wine that entire year. When the Temple will be rebuilt, his priestly watch might be called upon to serve, and he is unaware of the appointed time for his Temple service.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: I say that in accordance with this reasoning it is prohibited for any priest to drink wine at any time, even if he knows his priestly watch, as the order of the watches might change when the Temple is rebuilt, or perhaps all the watches will participate in the rededication of Temple. However, what can I do, as his misfortune is his advantage?^N The unfortunate fact that so many years have passed since the destruction of the Temple means that this decree prohibiting the priests from drinking cannot be sustained. **Abaye said:** In accordance with whose opinion do priests drink wine nowadays?^H It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi.

S The mishna teaches: It is prohibited for both the members of the priestly watch and the members of the non-priestly watch to cut their hair or launder their garments throughout the week, but on Thursday they are permitted^H to cut their hair and launder their clothes in deference to Shabbat. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for these prohibitions? **Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said:** These prohibitions were enacted in order to ensure that the priests will cut their hair and launder their clothes during the week before their service, so that they will not enter their priestly watch when they are unkempt.^N

HALAKHA

In accordance with whose opinion do priests drink wine nowadays – **במאן שתו האידינא כהני חמרא** – If a priest knows the identity of his priestly watch and patrilineal family, and he also knows that his family was established as fit to serve in the Temple, it is prohibited for him to drink wine throughout the day on which his patrilineal family used to serve. If he knows his watch but does not know his patrilineal family, it is prohibited for him to drink wine throughout the week in which his watch served in the Temple. If the priest is unaware of either his priestly watch or his patrilineal family, by right he should be permanently barred from drinking wine. However, his ignorance works to his advantage and

he is permitted to drink wine, as he will not be able to serve in the Temple, even when it is rebuilt, until his priestly watch and patrilineal family are established (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:7).

But on Thursday they are permitted – **ובחמישי מותרין**: It is prohibited for the members of the priestly watch and the patrilineal family on duty in the Temple to cut their hair or launder their clothes during the period of their service, so that they not enter their watch with untrimmed hair or dirty clothing (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:2).

A king cuts his hair every day – מלך מסתפר בכל יום: A king must cut his hair and groom himself every day. Furthermore, he must dress in appropriate and splendid garments, in accordance with the verse (Isaiah 33:17) “Your eyes shall see the king in his beauty” (Rambam *Sefer Shofetim, Hilkhot Melakhim UMilhemoteihem* 2:5).

A High Priest cuts his hair every Friday – כהן גדול מערב שבת: A High Priest must never let his hair grow long, even if he does not enter the Temple. Rather, he must cut his hair at least once a week, on Fridays (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 5:6).

A common priest once every thirty days – כהן הדיוט אחת לשלשים יום: A common priest who serves in the Temple must cut his hair at least once every thirty days (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:11).

An unspecified naziriteship – סתם נזירות: If one vows to be a nazirite without specifying a time limit, he is a nazirite for a period of thirty days (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 3:1).

It is when one enters that it is prohibited – בזמן ביאה: Just as it is prohibited for a priest to drink wine only when he enters the Temple, it is likewise prohibited for him to let his hair grow long only when he enters the Temple. Some authorities claim that a priest may not let his hair grow long even when he does not actually enter the Temple. It is only when there is no Temple that he is permitted to let his hair grow long (Ra'avad; Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:10).

LANGUAGE

Numerical value [gimatriya] – גימטריא: From the Greek γεωμετρία, *geometria*, which means measurement or calculation in general, although it later came to refer to a specific type of calculation. In rabbinic literature, it also refers broadly to mathematical calculations, and specifically for tabulating the numerical value of the letters.

תנו רבנן: מלך מסתפר בכל יום, כהן גדול מערב שבת לערב שבת, כהן הדיוט אחת לשלשים יום. מלך מסתפר בכל יום. מאי טעמא? אמר רבי אבא בר זבדא: אמר קרא: “מלך בימיו תחזינה עיניך”. כהן גדול מערב שבת לערב שבת. מאי טעמא? אמר רב שמואל בר יצחק: הואיל ומשמרות מתחדשות.

“כהן הדיוט אחת לשלשים יום”. מנלן? אתיא “פרע” “פרע” מניזיר. כתיב הכא: “וראשם לא יגלחו, ופרע לא ישלחו”, וכתיב התם: “קדש יהיה, גדל פרע שער ראשו”. מה להלן שלשים, אף כאן שלשים.

וניזיר גופיה מנלן? אמר רב מתנה: סתם נזירות שלשים יום. מנלן? אמר קרא: “יהיה”, בגימטריא תלתין הוי. אמר ליה רב פפא לאבבי: ודלמא הכי קאמר רחמנא: לא לירבו כלל! אמר ליה: אי הוה כתיב: “לא ישלחו פרע”, בדקאמרת. השתא דכתיב: “ופרע לא ישלחו”, פרע ליהו, שלוחי הוא דלא לישראל.

אי הכי, אפילו האידידנא נמי! דומיא דשתויי יין, מה שתויי יין, בזמן ביאה הוא דאסור, שלא בזמן ביאה שרי, אף הכא נמי.

והתנא: רבי אומר: אומר אני: כהנים אסורים לשתות יין לעולם. אבל מה אעשה? שתקנתו קלקלתו. ואמר אבבי: כמאן שתו האידידנא כהני חמרא

The Sages taught: A king cuts his hair every day,^H a High Priest cuts his hair every Friday,^H and a common priest once every thirty days. The Gemara clarifies: A king cuts his hair every day. What is the reason for this? Rabbi Abba bar Zavda said that the verse states: “Your eyes shall see the king in his beauty” (Isaiah 33:17), which indicates that a king must always look his best. A High Priest cuts his hair every Friday. The Gemara asks: What is the reason for this? Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak^P said: Since the watches are renewed and changed every Friday, it is fitting for every watch to see the High Priest with his hair perfectly groomed.

§ A common priest cuts his hair once every thirty days.^H The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this number? It is derived by a verbal analogy from the word *pera* with regard to priests and *pera* in connection with a nazirite. It is written here, concerning priests: “Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks [*pera*] to grow long” (Ezekiel 44:20), and it is written there, with regard to a nazirite: “He shall be sacred, he shall let the locks [*pera*] of the hair of his head grow long” (Numbers 6:5). Just as there, a nazirite who does not specify any other time period cuts his hair after thirty days, so too here, a priest cuts his hair every thirty days.

The Gemara asks: And a nazirite himself, from where do we derive that he may not cut his hair for thirty days? Rav Mattana^P said: It is a principle that an unspecified naziriteship^H lasts thirty days. The Gemara inquires: From where do we derive this principle? The Gemara answers that the verse states: “He shall be [*yihye*] sacred” (Numbers 6:5), and the numerical value [*gimatriya*]^L of *yihye* is thirty. Rav Pappa said to Abaye: But perhaps this is what the Merciful One is saying in the Torah: They should not grow their hair at all, as they must cut it every day. Abaye said to him: If it were written: They shall not grow long their locks, I might have explained as you originally said. Now that it is written: “Nor suffer their locks to grow long,” this indicates that they may have locks, but they may not let them grow long.

The Gemara asks: If it is so that cutting one’s hair is a necessary preparation for the Temple service by Torah law, then even nowadays priests should cut their hair every thirty days as well, in case the Temple is rebuilt and they must resume their service. The Gemara answers: This issue is similar to the prohibition concerning those who have drunk wine. Just as with regard to those who have drunk wine, it is when one enters the Temple that it is prohibited,^H whereas when one does not enter the Temple it is permitted to drink wine, here the same also applies.

The Gemara questions this conclusion: But isn’t it taught in the aforementioned *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: I say that it is prohibited for all priests to drink wine at any time. However, what can I do, as his misfortune is his advantage? And Abaye said: In accordance with whose opinion do priests drink wine nowadays?

PERSONALITIES

Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak – רב שמואל בר יצחק: A Babylonian *amora* of the third generation, Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak was one of Rav’s younger students. He later became a disciple of Rav Huna. Like many of Rav Huna’s students, he immigrated to Eretz Yisrael, apparently when he was middle-aged. Although no statements of his in the name of Rabbi Yohanan are recorded, he is presented as engaged in discussion with Rabbi Yohanan’s students, some of whom quote him. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak’s aggadic and halakhic statements are found both in the Babylonian Talmud and in the Jerusalem Talmud. While it is unknown

what he did for a living, it is known that his daughter married Rabbi Hoshaya. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzhak conducted himself with humility and deferred to those younger than himself. He used to dance before brides to delight them, as stated in tractate *Ketubot* in the Babylonian Talmud (17a), and in tractate *Pe’a* in the Jerusalem Talmud.

Rav Mattana – רב מתנה: A second-generation Babylonian *amora*, Rav Mattana studied with first-generation *amora’im* in Babylonia. His name is possibly a shortened form of the biblical name Matanya. He was a disciple of Shmuel, although he

also transmitted statements in the name of Rav. Rav Mattana’s colleague, Rav Yehuda, was also a disciple of Rav and Shmuel. Many third-generation *amora’im* were Rav Mattana’s pupils, and they transmitted statements in his name. Rav Mattana lived in Paphunya, near Pumbedita. He was the rabbi of that town and may also have headed a small academy there. According to a tradition of the *geonim*, Rav Mattana was the son of the great *amora* Rabbi Yohanan of Eretz Yisrael, who had ten sons that died during his lifetime. He was sent by his father to Babylonia to study with Shmuel.

NOTES

From the fact that the Rabbis prohibit – מְקַלְלֵי דְרַבְנָן – אֶבְיָה: Some commentaries point out that Abaye himself did not act in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as he was a priest from the house of Eli. It is related that Rava told Abaye's widow that Abaye would never drink wine (*Ketubot* 65a). When Abaye asked how the priests of his day could drink wine, he was simply referring to the prevalent custom, which he himself did not follow (Rabbeinu Hananel).

May the Temple be speedily rebuilt – מִהֲרָה יִבְנֶה בַּיִת: Some early commentaries claim that one of the reasons that priests act in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi nowadays, in contradiction to the majority opinion of the Rabbis, is that the decree is based on a very far-fetched concern. Even if the Temple were speedily to be rebuilt, the priestly watches might be completely reorganized, or the entire priesthood might serve together at the rededication ceremonies. Consequently, there is no reason why it should be prohibited for a particular priest to drink wine on a certain day on account of the watch of his ancestors during the Second Temple period (see Meiri).

כְּרַבִּי מִקְלָל דְרַבְנָן אֶסְרִי. מַאי טַעְמָא?
מִהֲרָה יִבְנֶה בַּיִת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, וְיִבְעִינן כְּהֵן
הָרָאוּ לְעַבְדוּדָה, וְלִיכָא. הָכָא, אֶפְשָׁר
דְּמִסְפָּר וְעֵייל.

אִי הָכִי, שְׁתוּי יוֹן נִמְי. אֶפְשָׁר דְּגַנְי פּוֹרְתָא
וְעֵייל, כְּדָרְמִי בַר אַבָּא. דְּאָמַר רְמִי בַר
אַבָּא: דְּרַךְ מִיל וְשִׁינָה כָּל שְׁהוּא מְפִיגִין
אֶת הַיַּיִן. לָאוּ מִי אֵיתְמַר עֲלֵיהּ: אָמַר רַב
נַחְמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַר אַבּוּה: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֱלָא
בְּשִׁשְׁתָּהּ שִׁיעוּר רְבִיעִית? אֲבָל שְׁתָּהּ
וַיִּתֵּר מִרְבִּיעִית כָּל שָׁבוֹן שְׁדַרְךָ מְטוּרְדָתוֹ
וְשִׁינָה מְשַׁבְּרָתוֹ.

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: שְׁתוּי יוֹן דְּמַחְלֵי עַבְדוּדָה,
גְּזוּרוּ בַּהּ רַבְנָן. פְּרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ דְּלֹא מַחְלֵי
עַבְדוּדָה, לֹא גְזוּרוּ בַּהּ רַבְנָן.

מִיתִיבִי: וְאֵלוּ שְׁהֵן בְּמִיתָה: שְׁתוּי יוֹן,
וּפְרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ. בְּשִׁלְמָא שְׁתוּי יוֹן בְּהָדִיא
כְּתִיב בַּהּ: "וַיִּין וְשָׁכַר אֶל תִּשְׁתֵּי". אֱלָא
פְּרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ מִנְלָן?

דְּכְתִיב: "וְרֹאשָׁם לֹא יִגְלַחוּ, וּפְרַע לֹא
יִשְׁלַחוּ". וְכְתִיב בְּתַרְיָה: "וַיִּין לֹא יִשְׁתוּ
כָּל כֹּהֵן, בְּבוֹאֵם אֶל הַחֲצֵר הַפְּנִימִית".
וְאֵיתְקוּשׁ פְּרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ לְשְׁתוּי יוֹן:
מִה שְׁתוּי יוֹן בְּמִיתָה, אִף פְּרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ
בְּמִיתָה.

It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. From the fact that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi permits priests to drink wine, it may be inferred that the Rabbis prohibitⁿ it even nowadays. Why, then, isn't it prohibited for priests to grow their hair as well? The Gemara explains: What is the reason for the prohibition? It is due to the hope: May the Temple be speedily rebuilt,ⁿ and we will require a priest who is fit for the Temple service, and there will be none available, as they have all imbibed wine. The time that it will take for the effects of the wine to wear off will delay the Temple service considerably. Here, however, with regard to hair, it is possible for a priest to cut his hair and be ready to enter and perform the Temple service with minimal delay.

The Gemara asks: If so, with regard to those who have drunk wine too, it is possible for him to sleep a little and then enter, in accordance with the opinion of Rami bar Abba, as Rami bar Abba said: Walking a distance of a *mil*, and similarly, sleeping even a minimal amount,ⁿ will dispel the effect of wine that one has drunk. The Gemara rejects this proof: Wasn't it stated about this *halakha* that Rav Nahman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: They taught this only with regard to one who has drunk the measure of a quarter-log of wine, but with regard to one who has drunk more than a quarter-log, walking this distance will preoccupy and exhaust him all the more, and a small amount of sleep will further intoxicate him. For this reason, it is prohibited for priests to drink wine, lest no suitable priest will be ready for the Temple service.

Rav Ashi said that there is a different way to distinguish between these two *halakhot*. In the case of those who have drunk wine,ⁿ who desecrate the Temple service, the Sages issued a decree concerning them, that priests should not drink wine even nowadays. However, with regard to those who have long hair,ⁿ who do not desecrate the Temple service, the Sages did not issue a decree concerning them.

The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: And these are the transgressors who are punished by death at the hand of Heaven: Priests who enter the Temple to serve who have drunk wine, and those priests who have long hair while they serve. The Gemara asks: Granted, those who have drunk wine are punished by death, as it is explicitly written: "Drink no wine nor strong drink, neither you nor your sons with you, when you enter the Tent of Meeting, that you should not die" (Leviticus 10:9). However, with regard to those priests who have long hair, from where do we derive that they are punishable by death?

The Gemara answers that this is as it is written: "Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks [*pera*] to grow long" (Ezekiel 44:20), and it is written immediately afterward: "Neither shall any priest drink wine when they enter the inner courtyard" (Ezekiel 44:21). And in this manner the prohibition concerning those who have long hair is juxtaposed with the prohibition concerning those who have drunk wine, to teach the following: Just as those who have drunk wine and perform the Temple service are subject to death, so too, those who have long hair are punishable by death.

HALAKHA

Walking a distance of a *mil* and sleeping a minimal amount – דְּרַךְ מִיל וְשִׁינָה כָּל שְׁהוּא: A walk of a *mil* or a minimal amount of sleep dissipates the intoxicating effects of wine, provided that only a quarter-log or less has been consumed. However, if one has drunk more than a quarter-log of wine, sleep merely renders him more intoxicated, and walking makes him more unsteady (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 99:2).

Those who have drunk wine – שְׁתוּי יוֹן: If a priest who is fit for service in the Temple has drunk wine, he is prohibited to

go beyond the altar in the Temple courtyard. If he enters and performs the Temple service, his service is disqualified and he is subject to death at the hand of Heaven (*Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:1).

Those who have long hair – פְּרוּעֵי רֹאשׁ: If a priest has let his hair grow long, it is prohibited for him to go beyond the altar in the Temple courtyard. If he enters and serves, he is subject to death at the hand of Heaven, but his service is not disqualified (*Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Biat HaMikdash* 1:8–9).

No, when they were juxtaposed – לֹא בִּי אִתְקוּשׁ – The commentary follows the standard text of the Talmud, that this is a rebuttal to the objection raised against Rav Ashi's contention that the service of a priest who has drunk wine is disqualified, whereas the service of a priest with long hair is not. The Gemara suggested that as an analogy is drawn between the punishments for serving in the Temple after imbibing wine and for serving with long hair, a similar analogy can be drawn between the two prohibitions concerning the disqualification of the service, in accordance with the principle that there cannot be juxtaposition halfway, i.e., a comparison must be fully accepted with regard to all relevant *halakhot*. Indeed, in the parallel passage in *Sanhedrin* 22b, the Gemara concludes its objection with the phrase: It is difficult, a reading also found in some manuscripts of the Gemara here, and no resolution of the difficulty is offered. However, in the standard texts of this Gemara the objection is simply met with the unexplained claim that the analogy drawn between the two prohibitions does not extend to the disqualification of the Temple service.

Some commentaries explain that Rav Ashi's comments in the continuation of the passage provide an answer to this objection (Ritva). There it says that Ravina asks: Before Ezekiel, who said that it is prohibited for a priest to let his hair grow long? Rav Ashi explains that there was an oral tradition to this effect going back to Sinai, long before Ezekiel's time. Accordingly, these verses in Ezekiel cannot be viewed as the source of this *halakha* but merely as the prophet's formulation of an established ruling of the Oral Law. If so, the principle that a juxtaposition cannot be applied by half measures has no bearing on this case at all, as the *halakha* of priests who let their hair grow long is not in fact derived from the verse that features the term *pera*.

These are the days on which fasting is prohibited – אֵלֵּין יוֹמֵינָא – According to most early authorities, the prohibition against eulogizing is considered a further stringency than the prohibition against fasting. Consequently, the prohibition against fasting applies on all the days recorded in *Megillat Ta'anit*, whereas the ban against eulogies applies only on the more festive days. Some commentaries add that fasting is a graver violation of a commemorative day than the delivery of a eulogy, as one who fasts suffers throughout the day (Ritva). Others state that as eulogies are delivered in honor of the deceased or those who survive him, the prohibition against eulogizing was instituted only on the more festive days mentioned in *Megillat Ta'anit* (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

Conversely, some commentaries maintain the opposite, that the prohibition against fasting is a further stringency than that of eulogizing. According to this interpretation, the delivery of a eulogy is regarded as a greater violation of a Festival, as a eulogy is delivered in public (Rabbeinu Efrayim, cited by Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi, Ritva, and *Shita Mekubbetzet*). Consequently, the prohibition against eulogizing applies on all the days recorded in *Megillat Ta'anit*, whereas fasting is prohibited on only some of the days. The standard text of the Talmud supports the opinion of the majority of the early commentaries, as the ruling of Rabbeinu Efrayim requires a considerable number of textual emendations.

The daily offering was established... the festival of *Shavuot* was restored – אֵיתוּקָם תְּמִידָא... אֵיתוּבַת חֲנָא דְשְׁבוּעָא – The *ge'onim* were asked about the difference in wording between these two decrees. Indeed, certain variants of the text use identical expressions for the decrees. Nevertheless, the *ge'onim* explained that there is a difference between the daily offering, which was always sacrificed at the proper time and simply had to be properly established as paid by the communal gift-offerings, and the restoration of the festival of *Shavuot*, whose very date the Boethusians tried to change.

ומינה, אי מה שתויי יין דמחלי עבודה, אף פרועי ראש דמחלי עבודה! לא. כי איתקוש, למיתה הוא דאתקוש. אבך לאחולי עבודה, לא אתקוש.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And from this comparison one can also argue as follows: If so, just as those who have drunk wine desecrate the Temple service, so too, those who have long hair desecrate the service.** The Gemara rejects this contention: **No, when the two cases were juxtaposed,ⁿ it was with regard to death that they were juxtaposed. However, as for desecrating the Temple service, in this regard they were not juxtaposed.** Consequently, Rav Ashi's distinction concerning the practical application of these two *halakhot* still applies.

אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי: הא מקמי דאתא יחזקאל מאן אמרה? אמר ליה: ולטעמין, הא דאמר רב חסדא: דבר זה מתורת משה לא למדני, ומדברי קבלה למדני: "כל בן נכר, ערל לב, וערל בשר, לא יבוא אל מקדשי". הא מקמי דאתא יחזקאל, מאן אמרה?

On this issue, Ravina said to Rav Ashi: **Before Ezekiel came and stated this *halakha*, who said it?** From where was it derived before Ezekiel that priests may not serve with long hair? This prohibition, which is not mentioned in the Torah, could not have been innovated by Ezekiel, as prophets may not enact new *halakhot*. Rav Ashi said to him: **And according to your reasoning, there is a similar difficulty with that which Rabbi Hisda said: This matter, that an uncircumcised priest may not serve in the Temple, we did not learn it from the Torah of Moses, but we learned it from the text of the tradition, i.e., Prophets and Writings: "No stranger, uncircumcised in heart or uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter my Temple" (Ezekiel 44:9). Before Ezekiel came, who said that it is prohibited for an uncircumcised priest to serve?**

Rather, you must say that it is learned as a definite tradition, like the rest of the Oral Torah, and Ezekiel came and supported it by means of a verse in his book. He did not, however, teach this *halakha* anew. Here too, with regard to a priest with long hair, it is learned as a tradition, and Ezekiel came and supported it by a verse. And when they learned this *halakha*, they learned only that one is punishable by death; however, with regard to desecrating the Temple service, they did not learn this *halakha*.

אלא. אמרא גמיר לה, ואתא יחזקאל ואסמכה אקרא. הקא נמי אמרא גמיר לה, ואתא יחזקאל ואסמכה אקרא. כי גמירי הלכה, למיתה. לאחולי עבודה, לא גמירי.

§ The mishna teaches: **Any day concerning which it is written in *Megillat Ta'anit* not to eulogize on that day, it is also prohibited to fast on the day before, but it is permitted to do so on the following day. The Sages taught in *Megillat Ta'anit*: These are the days on which fasting is prohibited,ⁿ and on some of them eulogizing is prohibited as well: From the New Moon of Nisan until the eighth of the month, the proper sacrifice of the daily offering was established, and therefore it was decreed not to eulogize on these dates. From the eighth of Nisan until the end of the festival of Passover, the festival of *Shavuot* was restored^{nB} and it was likewise decreed not to eulogize during this period.**

"כל הכתוב במגילת תענית דלא למיספד, לפניו אסור, לאחריו מותר". תנו רבנן: אֵלֵּין יוֹמֵינָא דְלֹא לְהִתְעַנֵּי בְהוֹן, וּמְקַצְתְּהוֹן דְלֹא לְמִסְפַּד בְּהוֹן. מְרִישֵׁי יְרַחָא דְנִסָּן וְעַד תְּמַנְיָא בֵּיה, אֵיתוּקָם תְּמִידָא. דְלֹא לְמִסְפַּד בְּהוֹן. מְתַמְנְיָא בֵּיה עַד סוּף מוֹעֵדָא, אֵיתוּבַת חֲנָא דְשְׁבוּעָא, דְלֹא לְמִסְפַּד בְּהוֹן.

BACKGROUND

The daily offering was established... the festival of *Shavuot* was restored – אֵיתוּקָם תְּמִידָא... אֵיתוּבַת חֲנָא דְשְׁבוּעָא – These commemorative days, like the others listed in *Megillat Ta'anit*, are associated with the struggles of the Sages against the Sadducees and the Boethusians. Apparently these cults received significant support from the Hasmonean kings and many important priests who followed them.

The sacrifice of the daily offering refers to the victory over the Sadducees, who claimed that it is permitted to bring this animal from individual gift-offerings. This was a fundamental dispute, as the Sages insisted that the expenses of the Temple sacrificial rites must be taken away from the control of individuals, which in practice meant priests and important

persons. Instead, they said, it must be a true communal offering shared by the entire community by means of the universal donation of the half-shekel.

The restoration of the festival of *Shavuot* is connected to a different, long-standing dispute with the Boethusians, who maintained that the phrase "On the morrow after Shabbat" (Leviticus 23:11), which discusses the *omer* offering, refers to the day after Shabbat. Accordingly, they always celebrated *Shavuot* on a Sunday. The Boethusians used every means at their disposal to enforce their opinion, including bribing witnesses and misleading the court (see *Rosh HaShana* 22b). The victory of the Sages in this dispute removed a serious obstacle to the proper observance of the Festival.

NOTES

As the New Moon is itself a holiday – ראש חודש גופיה – Rashi explains that the New Moon is considered a holiday in accordance with the interpretation of the verse: “He has called a solemn assembly [moed] against me” (Lamentations 1:15), as a reference to the New Moon (see 29a). The term moed is one of the biblical synonyms for a holiday. Others suggest that the verse “And on the day of your rejoicing, and on your appointed seasons, and on your New Moons” (Numbers 10:10) equates New Moons and the other holidays with regard to fasting and eulogizing (Rabbi Elyakim).

אמר מר: מריש ירחא דניסן עד תמניא ביה, איתוקם תמידא. דלא למיספד. למה לי מריש ירחא? לימא מתרי בניסן, וראש חודש גופיה יום טוב הוא ואסור! אמר רב: לא נצרכה אלא לאסור יום שלפניו.

The Gemara seeks to clarify these statements by comparing them to the ruling of the mishna. The Master said above: From the New Moon of Nisan until the eighth of the month, the daily offering was established, and therefore it was decreed not to eulogize on these dates. The Gemara asks: Why do I need Megillat Ta’anit to say: From the New Moon? Let it say: From the second of Nisan, as the New Moon is itself a holiday,^N and it is already prohibited to eulogize on that day. Rav said: It is necessary to mention the New Moon of Nisan only to prohibit eulogizing on the day before, in accordance with the statement in Megillat Ta’anit that fasting on the day before any of the specified commemorative days is also prohibited.

ושלפניו נמי – תיפוק ליה דהוה ליה יום שלפני ראש חודש! ראש חודש דאורייתא הוא, ודאורייתא לא בעי חיזוק.

The Gemara asks: And with regard to the day before the New Moon of Nisan as well, one can derive the prohibition against eulogizing on this day from the fact that it is the day before the New Moon. Since it is prohibited to fast on the New Moon, it is likewise prohibited on the day before. The Gemara answers that as the New Moon is by Torah law and a Torah law requires no reinforcement, it is permitted to fast on the previous day.

דתניא: הימים האלה הכתובין במגילת תענית – לפנייהם ולאחרייהם אסורין. שבתות וימים טובים – הן אסורין, לפנייהן ולאחרייהן מותרין. ומה הפרש בין זה לזה? הללו דברי תורה, ודברי תורה אין צריכין חיזוק. הללו דברי סופרים, ודברי סופרים צריכין חיזוק.

As it is taught in a baraita: With regard to these days that are written in Megillat Ta’anit, it is prohibited to fast before them and after them. However, concerning Shabbatot and Festivals, fasting on those days is prohibited, but before them and after them fasting is permitted. And what is the difference between this and that? These, Shabbat and Festivals, are statements of Torah, and statements of Torah do not require reinforcement, whereas these days mentioned in Megillat Ta’anit are statements of rabbinic law, and statements of rabbinic law require reinforcement.

אמר מר: מתמניא ביה עד סוף המועד, למה לי עד סוף המועד? לימא עד המועד, ומועד גופיה יום טוב הוא ואסור! אמר רב פפא: כדאמר רב: לא נצרכא

The Master said above: From the eighth of Nisan until the end of the festival of Passover, the festival of Shavuot was restored and it was decreed not to eulogize. The Gemara asks: Why do I need Megillat Ta’anit to say: Until the end of the Festival? Let it say: Until the Festival, as it is anyway prohibited to eulogize on the festival of Passover. Rav Pappa said that this, too, should be explained as Rav said: It is necessary to mention the first of Nisan

Perek II Daf 18 Amud a

NOTES

In accordance with whose opinion, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei – כמאן, כרבי יוסי – Some commentaries explain that the Gemara is asking why the halakha is in accordance with the minority opinion of Rabbi Yosei (Rashi; Shita Mekubbetzet). However, most commentaries maintain that this statement is not a question, but a preamble to the difficulty that results if it is claimed that Megillat Ta’anit is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei’s opinion.

LANGUAGE

Matron [matronita] – מטרוניתא – From the Aramaic form of the Latin matrona, meaning woman, especially an important woman. In the time of the Mishna, many women of the noble class admired the Jews and their religion, and some even converted to Judaism.

אלא לאסור יום שלפניו, הכא נמי לא נצרכה אלא לאסור יום שלאחריו. כמאן? כרבי יוסי, דאמר: בין לפניו ובין לאחריו אסור? אי הכי, בעשרים ותשעה נמי, מאי אריא דהוי יומא דמקמי יומא דמיתוקם תמידא? תיפוק ליה דהוה ליה יומא דבתר עשרין ותמניא ביה.

only to prohibit eulogizing on the day before. Here too, it is necessary to mention Passover only to prohibit eulogizing on the following day. The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is this ruling? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei,^N who said that eulogizing is prohibited both on the day before the date recorded in Megillat Ta’anit and on the following day. The Gemara asks: If so, with regard to the twenty-ninth of Adar too, why state specifically that eulogizing is prohibited then because it is the day before the day on which the daily offering was established? Let him derive this prohibition from the fact that it is the day after the twenty-eighth of Adar.

דתניא: בעשרים ותמניא ביה אתת בשורתא טבתא ליהודאי דלא יעידון מן אורייתא. שפעם אחת גזרה מלכות הרשעה שמד על ישראל שלא יעסקו בתורה, ושלא ימולו את בניהם, ושיחללו שבתות. מה עשה יהודה בן שמוע וחבריו? הלכו ונטלו עצה ממטרוניתא אחת שכל גדולי רומי מצויין אצלה.

As it is taught in Megillat Ta’anit: On the twenty-eighth of Adar good tidings came to the Jews, that they would not be restricted from Torah study, and they declared this date a commemorative day. The baraita proceeds to describe the events of this day. As on one occasion the wicked empire, Rome, issued a decree of apostasy against the Jews, that they may not occupy themselves with Torah study, and that they may not circumcise their sons, and that they must desecrate Shabbat. What did Yehuda ben Shammua and his colleagues do? They went and sought the advice of a certain Roman matron [matronita]^L whose company was kept by all the prominent people of Rome.