And according to the one who said that they split, let them split it – רָבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל חֲמַרְךָ שְׁמוּאֵל פָּרָשָׁה ברַבִּי תָּאָבִיב. Rashi explains that the opinions of both Rav and Shmuel are contradicted by the clause of the baraita that states that a five-verse section should be read by one individual, as according to both of them it is possible for the section to be read by two people, either by repeating or splitting the verse. In a parallel passage in Megilla 22a, Rashi says that the following line should be omitted: And according to the one who said that he divides the verse let him divide it. He explains that the difficulty is raised from the last part of the baraita, which states that if the first reader read three verses from a five-verse section, the second one should read the next two verses of that section and one or three verses from the subsequent section. That clause is difficult for the opinion of Rav, as it is possible for the second reader to reread the third verse and continue with the next two verses. However, there is no difficulty according to the opinion of Shmuel, as the first reader has already read the third verse, and therefore it is no longer possible to divide that verse between the two readers (see Tosafot, Rashi, and Ritva on Megilla 22a).

The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: A chapter consisting of six verses may be read by two individuals, and a chapter of five verses must be read by one. And if the first individual reads three verses from the five-verse chapter, the second one reads the last two verses of that chapter and one more from another chapter. And some say that three verses are read from the next chapter, as one may not begin to read a chapter for fewer than three verses.

The Gemara explains the objection: According to the one who said that they repeat the middle verse, let the second reader repeat a verse here as well. And according to the one who said that they split a verse, here too, let them split it. Apparently, the baraita contradicts the opinions of both Rav and Shmuel. The Gemara answers: It is different there.
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And in the afternoon prayer they read by heart – וְאִם הָתָם מָמָרָה בַּעֲטֵרֶת הָעֵדֶת בִּשְׁנַיִם פָּחוֹת מִשְּׁלֹשָׁה. The same chapters that are read from a Torah scroll in the morning service are again read from a scroll in the additional service. In the afternoon service, they are read by heart (Rambam Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Keler HaMiludos 6:7).

The Gemara questions this last conclusion. And Shmuel said that one splits the middle verse into two. What is the reason that he did not say that he repeats one of the verses, in accordance with the opinion of Rav? The Gemara explains: It is a rabbinic decree due to those who enter the synagogue in the middle of the reading, and a decree due to those who leave in the middle. If someone entered or exited in the middle of the reading and heard three full verses, he might think that one of the readers had read fewer than three full verses, which might lead him to conclude that it is permitted to read fewer than three verses.

The Gemara raises an objection from a baraita: A chapter consisting of six verses may be read by two individuals, and a chapter of five verses must be read by one. And if the first individual reads three verses from the five-verse chapter, the second one reads the last two verses of that chapter and one more from another chapter. And some say that three verses are read from the next chapter, as one may not begin to read a chapter for fewer than three verses.

The Gemara explains the objection: According to the one who said that they repeat the middle verse, let the second reader repeat a verse here as well. And according to the one who said that they split a verse, here too, let them split it. Apparently, the baraita contradicts the opinions of both Rav and Shmuel. The Gemara answers: It is different there.

An individual reads it by heart – הִאֶזֶרָה אָרוֹן פָּרָשָׁה בַּכּוּלָּן. This apparently means that a member of the congregation would serve as a kind of prayer leader and read these chapters before the entire community. Rabbi Yosei takes issue with this ritual, as he maintains that the Torah is not read by heart by an individual in public, with the exception of the High Priest on Yom Kippur. Instead, everyone reads the chapter together (see Rit and Divrei Shlomo).
The mishna taught: On any day that has the recitation of hallel, but on which the additional offering was not sacrificed, it has no reading of the Torah by the non-priestly watch in the morning service. On days that have both hallel and an additional offering, there was no reading in the afternoon prayer. When a wood offering was brought, there was no reading in the closing prayer. The Gemara asks: What is the difference between this and that? In a day on which an additional offering is sacrificed and a day on which a wood offering is brought? The Gemara explains: These days, on which an additional offering is brought, apply by Torah law, but these days, on which a wood offering is brought, apply by rabbinic law, and therefore it overrides only the closing prayer.

The mishna continues with a list of the times for the wood offering of priests and the people. The Sages taught: Why was it necessary to state the times for the wood offering of priests and the people? They said in response that this is what happened: When the people of the exile ascended to Jerusalem in the beginning of the Second Temple period, they did not find enough wood in the Temple chamber for the needs of the altar. And these families arose and donated from their own wood to the Temple.

And the prophets among them stipulated as follows, that even if the entire chamber were full of wood, the descendants of these families would donate wood from their own property on these specific days, as it is stated: “And we cast lots, the priests, the Levites and the people, for the wood offering, to bring it into the house of our God, according to our fathers’ houses, at appointed times year by year, to burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the Torah” (Nehemiah 10:35). Although these donations were not always necessary, it was established that all generations would observe these days.

The mishna further taught that on the fifteenth of Av, wood was brought by the descendants of Zattu ben Yehuda, and with this group were other priests and Levites, and anyone who erred with regard to his tribe, i.e., Israelites who did not know which tribe they were from, and the descendants of those who deceived the authorities with a pestle, and the descendants of those who packed dried figs. The Sages taught: Who were the descendants of those who deceived the authorities with a pestle and the descendants of those who packed dried figs?

They said in explanation: Once, the evil kingdom of Greece issued a decree of apostasy against the Jews, that they may not bring wood for the arrangement of the altar and that they may not bring first fruits to Jerusalem. And they placed guards [prozda’ot] on the roads, in the manner that Jeroboam, son of Nevat, placed guards, so that the Jews could not ascend for the pilgrimage Festival.

What did the worthy and sin-fearing individuals of that generation do? They brought baskets of first fruits, and covered them with dried figs, and took them with a pestle on their shoulders. And when they reached the guards, the guards said to them: Where are you going? They said to them: We are going to prepare two round cakes of pressed figs with the mortar that is down the road before us and with the pestle that we are carrying on our shoulders. As soon as they passed the guards, they decorated the baskets of first fruits and brought them to Jerusalem.
The Gemara identifies this individual with David himself (Moed Katan 16b), whereas Midrash Tanhuma explains that it is a reference to Joab.

The descendants of Adin are the descendants of David, and on the twentieth of Elul, the wood offering was brought by the descendants of Pahath Moab ben Yehuda. A tanna taught: The descendants of Pahath Moab ben Yehuda are the descendants of David ben Yehuda. He is called Moab because Ruth the Moabitess was the grandmother of David’s father, Yishai. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosei says: These are the descendants of Joab, son of Zeruiah, whose mother was the daughter of Yishai and therefore also descended from Ruth.

The mishna further taught: On the twentieth of Elul, the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda brought their wood offering. The Sages taught: The descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of David ben Yehuda, who was called Adin. This is the statement of Rabbi Yosei. Rabbi Yosei says: These are the descendants of Joab, son of Zeruiah.

The mishna taught: On the first of Tevet, the descendants of Parosh returned to bring wood for a second time. The Gemara asks: Who is the author of this opinion of the mishna? It is not the opinion of Rabbi Meir, nor that of Rabbi Yehuda, nor that of Rabbi Yosei. The Gemara elaborates: If it represents the opinion of Rabbi Meir, let him teach, with regard to the twentieth of Av, that the descendants of David ben Yehuda returned for a second time. According to Rabbi Meir, the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of David, and consequently they would return for a second time on that date.

The Gemara continues: If it represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, let him teach that the descendants of David ben Yehuda returned for a second time on a different date, the twentieth of Elul, as he contends that the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of David. And if the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, let him teach that the descendants of Joab, son of Zeruiah, returned for a second time, as he maintains that the descendants of Pahath Moab and the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are both the descendants of Joab.
The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and there are two tanna’im whose opinion is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. One tanna maintains that only the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of Joab, while the other claims that only the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of Joab. According to both opinions, neither group was repeated a second time, and therefore the mishna does not pose a difficulty to either of them.
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The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and there are two tanna’im whose opinion is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. One tanna maintains that only the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of Joab, while the other claims that only the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of Joab. According to both opinions, neither group was repeated a second time, and therefore the mishna does not pose a difficulty to either of them.

The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and there are two tanna’im whose opinion is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. One tanna maintains that only the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of Joab, while the other claims that only the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of Joab. According to both opinions, neither group was repeated a second time, and therefore the mishna does not pose a difficulty to either of them.

The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and there are two tanna’im whose opinion is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. One tanna maintains that only the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of Joab, while the other claims that only the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of Joab. According to both opinions, neither group was repeated a second time, and therefore the mishna does not pose a difficulty to either of them.

The Gemara answers: Actually, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, and there are two tanna’im whose opinion is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei. One tanna maintains that only the descendants of Pahath Moab are the descendants of Joab, while the other claims that only the descendants of Adin ben Yehuda are the descendants of Joab. According to both opinions, neither group was repeated a second time, and therefore the mishna does not pose a difficulty to either of them.
The Gemara asks: And let the mishna also teach: On the first of Nisan there was no non-priestly watch because it is a day on which hallel is recited, and it is the New Moon, on which an additional offering is sacrificed, and there was also a wood offering. Rava said: That is to say that the hallel recited on a New Moon is not required by Torah law but is a custom.

As Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehozdak: On eighteen days a year, the individual completes the full hallel. And they are: The eight days of the festival of Sukkot, including the Eighth Day of Assembly; the eight days of Hanukkah; the first Festival day of Passover; and the Festival day of Assembly, i.e., Shavuot. And in the Diaspora, where a second day is added to each Festival due to uncertainty over the correct date, there are twenty-one days, and they are: The nine days of the festival of Sukkot, including the last day, known as the Celebration of the Torah, the eight days of Hanukkah, the first two days of Passover, and the two Festival days of Assembly.

On this topic, the Gemara relates: Rav happened to come to Babylonia; when he saw that they were reciting hallel on a New Moon. Unfamiliar with this practice, he thought to stop them, as he assumed that they were reciting hallel unnecessarily. Once he saw that they were omitting portions, he said: I can learn from this that they are maintaining the custom of their forefathers, i.e., they know that it is a custom, not an obligation. It is taught in a baraita: An individual should not begin reciting hallel on a New Moon, but if he has begun he should complete it.

§ The mishna taught: Five calamitous matters occurred to our forefathers on the seventeenth of Tamuz, one of which was that the tablets were broken. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the tablets were broken on this day? As it is taught in a baraita: On the sixth of the month of Sivan the Ten Commandments were given to the Jewish people. Rabbi Yosei says: It was on the seventh of that month. The Gemara comments: According to the one who said that they were given on the sixth of Sivan, they were given on the sixth, and on the seventh Moses ascended to Mount Sinai.

According to the one who said that the Ten Commandments were given on the seventh of Sivan, they were given on the seventh, and on the seventh Moses ascended to Mount Sinai, as it is written: “And He called to Moses on the seventh day out of the midst of the cloud” (Exodus 24:16), and it is written: “And Moses entered into the midst of the cloud, and he went up into the mount, and Moses was on the mount forty days and forty nights” (Exodus 24:18). The calculation is as follows: There were twenty-four days remaining in Sivan, plus the first sixteen days of Tammuz, which comes to forty days.
On the seventeenth of Tammuz, Moses descended, came, observed the people worshipping the Golden Calf, and broke the tablets. And it is written: “And it came to pass, as soon as he came near to the camp, that he saw the calf and the dancing, and Moses’ anger burned, and he cast the tablets out of his hands, and broke them beneath the mount” (Exodus 32:19). This shows that the tablets were shattered on the seventeenth of Tammuz.

The mishna taught that on the seventeenth of Tammuz the daily offering was nullified. The Gemara explains: It is a tradition that this occurred on that date.

The mishna further taught that on the seventeenth of Tammuz the city walls of Jerusalem were breached. The Gemara asks: Was this tragedy something that occurred on the seventeenth of Tammuz? But isn’t it written: “In the fourth month, on ninth of the month, the famine was severe in the city” (Jeremiah 52:6), and it is written immediately afterward: “Then a breach was made in the city” (Jeremiah 52:7), which clearly indicates that the city was breached on the ninth.

Rava said: This is not difficult, as here the verse is referring to the First Temple, whereas there, in the mishna, it describes the destruction of the Second Temple, as it is taught in a baraita. Upon the destruction of the First Temple, the city walls were breached on the ninth of Tammuz; and at the destruction of the Second Temple they were breached on the seventeenth of Tammuz.

The mishna further taught that on the seventeenth of Tammuz Apastemos publicly burned a Torah scroll. The Gemara explains: This, too, is a tradition.

The mishna also stated that on the seventeenth of Tammuz Manasseh placed an idol in the Sanctuary. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that this occurred on the seventeenth of Tammuz? As it is written: “And from the time that the daily offering shall be taken away and the abomination that causes appallment is set up” (Daniel 12:11), which indicates that an idol was placed in the Temple on the very day that the daily offering was suspended.

The Gemara asks: And was there only one idol placed there? But isn’t it written: “And upon the wing of detestable things shall be that which causes appallment” (Daniel 9:27)? The plural, “detestable things,” indicates the presence of at least two idols. Rava said: There were initially two idols, but one fell upon the other and broke its hand. Since only one idol was whole, the mishna mentions only that one. Rava continues: And an inscription was found on the broken idol that read:

You want to destroy the Temple; I have given you your hand. It is as though one idol said to the other: You are seeking to destroy the Temple by causing Israel to pray to you; I, too, give you a hand to assist you.

NOTES

The daily offering was nullified – אֲתָא בָּﬠִיר. Opinions differ with regard to the calamity mentioned here. The Jerusalem Talmud indicates that the seventeenth of Tammuz marks the suspension of the daily offering during the period of the Second Temple. Some commentaries maintain that this occurred during the First Temple period (Ramban: Seder Zemanim, Rikkhei Tannait 5:2). According to Rashi, the daily offering was canceled due to a decree banning its sacrifice, issued by the ruling foreign authorities. Others write that the offering was canceled because the necessary animals were no longer available on account of the siege of Jerusalem (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

The city walls were breached – בָּﬠִיר. Contrary to the explanation of the Gemara here, in the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that the breach in the walls of Jerusalem during the First Temple period also occurred on the seventeenth of Tammuz. However, due to the many calamities that overwhelmed the Jewish people at the time, errors occurred in the calculation of the calendar, and it was mistakenly believed that the breach happened on the ninth of the month. One commentary explains at length that the mistake arose when it became impossible to declare the beginning of the new month on the basis of the testimony of witnesses who had seen the new moon, and the calculations of the calendar were made in accordance with the solar rather than the lunar calendar (Maharsha).

Placed an idol in the Sanctuary – אֲתָא בָּﬠִיר. Some commentaries read: An idol was set up. They explain that the mishna is referring to the idol set up in the First Temple by Manasseh, King of Judah. One problem with this interpretation is that it would mean that the events listed in the mishna are not in chronological order (Gevurat Aar). Others read: He set up an idol, and explain that the mishna is speaking of the idol set up in the Second Temple by the same Roman officer, Apastemos, who burned a Torah scroll on the same day.