

NOTES

And according to the one who said that they split, let them split it – ולמאן דאמר פוסק ליפסוק – 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*, Rashba, and Ritva on *Megilla* 22a).

ושמואל אומר: פוסק. מאי טעמא לא אומר: דולג? גזירה משום הנכנסין. וגזירה משום היוצאין.

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.

מיתביבי: פרשה של ששה פסוקים קורין אותה בשנים, ושל חמשה ביחיד. ואם הראשון קורא שלשה, השני קורא שנים מפרשה זו, ואחד מפרשה אחרת. ויש אומרים: שלשה, לפי שאין מתחילין בפרשה פחות משלשה פסוקין.

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.

למאן דאמר דולג לידלוג ולמאן דאמר פוסק ליפסוק? שאני התם

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.ⁿ Apparently, the *baraita* contradicts the opinions of both Rav and Shmuel. The Gemara answers: It is different there,

Perek IV

Daf 28 Amud a

HALAKHA

ובמנחה – ובמנחה – And in the afternoon prayer they read by heart – קורין על פיהן: 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 Kelei HaMikdash* 6:7).

דאית ליה רווחא.

as the second reader has space, i.e., he has the option to read from the ensuing paragraph.

”פרשה גדולה קורין אותה בשנים בשחרית ובמוסף ובמנחה קורין על פיהן” כו. איבעיא להו היכי קאמר בשחרית ובמוסף קורין אותה בספר ובמנחה קורין אותה על פה בקורין את שמע או דלמא הכי קתני בשחרית קורין אותה בספר ובמוסף ובמנחה קורין אותה על פה בקורין את שמע.

§ The mishna taught: A long passage is read by two people, and they read from the Torah in the morning prayer and in the additional prayer. And in the afternoon prayer they read the daily portion by heart,ⁿ just as one recites *Shema*. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: With regard to what case is the *tanna* speaking? Does he mean that in the morning prayer and in the additional prayer they read the portion from a Torah scroll, but in the afternoon prayer each individual reads by heart, just as one recites *Shema*? Or perhaps this is what is taught: In the morning prayer they read it from a Torah scroll, but in the additional prayer and in the afternoon prayer they read it by heart, just as one recites *Shema*.

תא שמע דתניא בשחרית ובמוסף נכנסין לבית הכנסת וקורין בדרך שקורין כל השנה ובמנחה יחיד קורא אותה על פה. אומר רבי יוסי וכי יחיד יכול לקרות דברי תורה על פה בציבור אלא בולן נכנסין וקורין אותה על פה בקורין את שמע.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear, as it is taught in a *baraita*: In the morning prayer and in the additional prayer they would enter the synagogue and read from the Torah in the manner that they read all year. But in the afternoon prayer, a single individual would read the portion for that day by heart.ⁿ Rabbi Yosei said: But can an individual read matters of Torah by heart in the presence of the community? Rather, they all enter and read that day’s portion together, just as one recites *Shema*. This *baraita* clearly indicates that they would read by heart only in the afternoon service.

NOTES

An individual reads it by heart – יחיד קורא אותה על פה – 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 *Rid* and *Divrei Shlomo*).

מה הפרש בין – What is the difference between this and that – **זה לזה**: Many interpretations have been offered for this obscure statement. Rashi explains the question as follows: Why is the closing prayer treated with less importance than the afternoon service? The Gemara's answer is that there is more of a basis for the afternoon service in the Torah (see Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes). Alternatively, the Gemara is inquiring about the difference between the two types of offering: Why does the additional offering override the afternoon service whereas the wood offering does not?

According to the Rambam, in his Commentary to the Mishna, the Gemara is asking why the recitation of *hallel* takes precedence over the wood offering. The answer is that *hallel* on Hanukkah applies by rabbinic law, and therefore the status of *hallel* is in need of reinforcement, whereas there is an allusion to the wood offering in the Torah. The Rambam's text of the Gemara apparently included the sentence: A matter of rabbinical law requires reinforcement, but a matter of Torah law does not require reinforcement.

Others understand the answer similarly, but interpret the Gemara's question in a different manner: Why should the wood offering, which applies by rabbinic law, override the non-priestly watch, for which there is more of a basis in the Torah?

Why was it necessary to state the times for the wood offering of priests and the people – זמן עצי כהנים והעם – Some commentaries read: Why was it necessary for the times of the wood of the priests and the people to be counted (Rabbeinu Hananel). According to this version, the *baraita* is asking: Why did the mishna need to specify that there are nine dates on which the wood offering is brought? Let it simply list the dates, and each reader can count them for himself. The *baraita* answers that the mishna enumerates the dates so as to emphasize their importance.

And donated from their own – והתנדבו משלהם – In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that although in later times there was enough ready wood in the Temple, they would still first use the wood brought by these families (see Meiri).

Who were the descendants of those who deceived with a pestle – מה היו בני גונבי עלי – The question of the *baraita* is based on the fact that the wood offerings were instituted to commemorate the generosity of those families who donated wood for the altar when the Second Temple was first built, whereas the pestle deceivers did not contribute wood in those early years. The *baraita* explains that the pestle deceivers were granted their own day to bring wood offerings, due to the special efforts they made to ensure that their first fruits would reach Jerusalem so that the sacrificial service would continue without interruption (Rabbi Elyakim).

BACKGROUND

The evil kingdom – מלכות הרשעה – Although this term is generally a reference to Rome, this incident apparently occurred during the period of Greek reign, and the decree was part of the persecutions that preceded the Hasmonean revolt. The version of the incident that appears in *Megillat Ta'anit* supports this claim.

Fig cakes – עגולי דבילה – In talmudic times, most figs were not eaten fresh. Rather, the major portion of the fig crop was dried in various ways. Typically, after picking the fruit they would cut off its stalk and place it to dry in the sun. At this stage, the fruit is called dry figs [*ketzi'ot*]. A sizeable proportion of the *ketzi'ot* would undergo the further processing stages of preservation and pressing, by being inserted into barrels or circular vessels. These were called *deveilim*. After preservation and a final drying, large and heavy circular fig cakes would be removed from the vessel, and slices would be cut off from these pressed fig cakes as required.

LANGUAGE

Guards [prozda'ot] – פרוזדאות – Probably from the Latin praesidia, meaning watches.

כל יום שיש בו הלל אין בו מעמד – בו. מה הפרש בין זה לזה? הללו דברי תורה, והללו דברי סופרים.

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,**^N 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.**

זמן עצי כהנים והעם – בו. תנו רבנן: למה הוצרכו לומר זמן עצי כהנים והעם? אמרו: כשעלו בני הגולה, לא מצאו עצים בלשכה, ועמדו אלו והתנדבו משלהם.

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?**^N 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**^N wood to the Temple.

ובך התנו נביאים שביניהן שאפילו לשכה מלאה עצים, יהיו אלו מתנדבין משלהן, שנאמר: "והגורלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים הכהנים, הלויים, והעם, להביא לבית אלהינו, לבית אבותינו, לעתים מוזמנים שנה בשנה, לבער על מזבח ה' אלהינו, בכתוב בתורה".

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.

ועמם כהנים ולויים וכל מי – בו. תנו רבנן: מה היו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות?

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**^N and the descendants of those who packed dried figs?

אמרו: פעם אחת גזרה מלכות הרשעה שמד על ישראל שלא יביאו עצים למערכה ושלא יביאו בכורים לירושלים, והושיבו פרוזדאות על הדרכים בדרך שהושיבו ירבעם בן נבט שלא יעלו ישראל לרגל.

They said in explanation: Once, the evil kingdom^B 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*]^L on the roads, in the manner that Jeroboam, son of Nevat, placed guards, so that the Jews could not ascend for the pilgrim Festival.

מה עשו בשרין ויראי חטא שבאותו הדור? הביאו סלי בכורים וחיפוסם בקציעות, ונטלום ועלי על בתפיהן, ובין שהגיעו אצל פרוזדאות, אמרו להם: להיכן אתם הולכין? אמרין להם: לעשות שני עגולי דבילה במכתשת שלפנינו ובעלי שעל בתפינו. כיון שעברו מהן, עיטרום בסלים, והביאום לירושלים.

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^B 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.

This was performed by the descendants of Salmāi – הַנְּתוּפָתִי – סַלְמַאי: Some commentaries explain that those very families who are referred to in the mishna as: Those who deceived the authorities with a pestle and those who pressed dried figs into cakes, were also known as the descendants of Salmāi of Netophat, due to another courageous act they performed (see *Tosefta* 3:8; Rabbi Ovadia MiBartenura). Rashi and others indicate that this refers to different people, and the *baraita* merely wishes to compare the efforts of two groups of people to circumvent evil decrees.

Of Netophat – הַנְּתוּפָתִי: The story related by the *baraita* does not account for the name: Of Netophat, the version of the standard texts of the Gemara. The Jerusalem Talmud, as well as certain manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud and the *Tosefta*, have the reading: Of Netotzat, which can be understood as referring to the dismantlement, from the root *n-t-tz*, of the ladders, whose wood was brought to the altar. The most plausible reading is: Of Netophat, with the first letter *tav* exchanged for a *tet*. If so, the entire *baraita* is a homiletic interpretation of the verse: “The sons of Salma: Bethlehem, and the Netophathites” (I Chronicles 2:54). Indeed, the *Targum* on that verse interprets the names by citing these two acts of artifice, which were employed to circumvent the decrees against bringing first fruits and wood to the Temple. He explains that the name Netophat means that the acts performed by those people were as good as balm [*netofa*] (see Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto).

The descendants of Adin... are the descendants of David – בְּנֵי עֲדִין... הֵן בְּנֵי דָוִד: This is based on a verse that appears in the list of David’s mighty men: “Chief of the captains, he was Adino the Ezrite” (I Samuel 23:8). The Gemara identifies this individual with David himself (*Moed Katan* 16b), whereas *Midrash Tanhuma* explains that it is a reference to Joab.

תָּנָא: הֵן הֵן בְּנֵי סַלְמַאי הַנְּתוּפָתִי. תְּנִי רַבְנָן: מַה הֵן בְּנֵי סַלְמַאי הַנְּתוּפָתִי? אָמְרוּ: פְּעַם אַחַת גִּזְרָה מַלְכוּת הַרְשָׁעָה שְׂמֹד עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁלֵא יָבִיאוּ יַעֲצִים לְמַעַרְכָּה, וְהוֹשִׁיבוּ פְרוּזְדָּאוֹת עַל הַדְּרָכִים בְּדֶרֶךְ שְׁהוֹשִׁיב יִרְבְּעָם בֵּן נֶבֶט עַל הַדְּרָכִים שְׁלֵא יַעֲלוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְרַגְלָא.

מַה עָשׂוּ יִרְאֵי חֲטָא שְׁבָאוֹתוֹ הַדּוֹר? הִבְיָאוּ גְזִירֵיהֶן וְעָשׂוּ סוּלְמוֹת, וְהִנְחִחוּ עַל כַּתְפֵיהֶם וְהִלְכוּ לָהֶם. בֵּינָן שְׁהִגִּיעוּ אֶצְלוֹ, אָמְרוּ לָהֶם: לְהֵיכָן אַתֶּם הוֹלְכִין? אָמְרוּ לָהֶם: לְהִבְיָא גּוֹזְלוֹת מִשׁוּבְךָ שְׁלַפְנֵינוּ, וּבְסוּלְמוֹת שְׁעַל כַּתְפֵינוּ. בֵּינָן שְׁעָבְרוּ מִהֶן, פִּירְקוּם וְהִבְיָאוּם, וְהַעֲלוּם לִירוּשָׁלַיִם.

וְעֲלֵיהֶם וְעַל כִּיּוֹצֵא בְהֶם הוּא אוֹמֵר: “וְזָכַר צְדִיק לְבְרָכָה,” וְעַל יִרְבְּעָם בֵּן נֶבֶט וְחִבְרִיו נְאֻמָּה: “יִשָּׁם רְשָׁעִים יִרְבֵּב.”

“בְּעֶשְׂרִים בּוֹ, בְּנֵי פַחַת מוֹאֵב בֵּן יְהוּדָה.” תָּנָא: בְּנֵי פַחַת מוֹאֵב בֵּן יְהוּדָה הֵן הֵן בְּנֵי דָוִד בֵּן יְהוּדָה. דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: הֵן הֵן בְּנֵי יוֹאֵב בֵּן צְרוּיָה.

“בְּעֶשְׂרִים בְּאֵלוֹל, בְּנֵי עֲדִין בֵּן יְהוּדָה,” וְכוּ'. תְּנִי רַבְנָן: בְּנֵי עֲדִין בֵּן יְהוּדָה הֵן הֵן בְּנֵי דָוִד בֵּן יְהוּדָה. דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: הֵן הֵן בְּנֵי יוֹאֵב בֵּן צְרוּיָה.

“בְּאַחַד בְּטִבֵּת, שָׁבוּ בְנֵי פְרַעוֹשׁ שְׁנִיָּה,” כּוּ'. מִנֵּי מִתְנִי? לֹא רַבִּי מֵאִיר, וְלֹא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וְלֹא רַבִּי יוֹסִי. אִי רַבִּי מֵאִיר, לִיתְנִי שָׁבוּ בְנֵי דָוִד בֵּן יְהוּדָה שְׁנִיָּה.

אִי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, לִיתְנִי שָׁבוּ בְנֵי דָוִד בֵּן יְהוּדָה שְׁנִיָּה. אִי רַבִּי יוֹסִי, לִיתְנִי שָׁבוּ בְנֵי יוֹאֵב בֵּן צְרוּיָה שְׁנִיָּה!

A Sage taught: This was something that was performed in a similar manner by the descendants of Salmāi^N of Netophat.^N The Gemara explains this comment by quoting a *baraita*. The Sages taught: Who are the descendants of Salmāi of Netophat? 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 on the roads, in the manner that Jeroboam, son of Nevat, placed guards, so that the Jews could not ascend for the pilgrim Festival.

What did the sin-fearing individuals of that generation do? They brought their pieces of wood and prepared ladders [*sulamot*], and they placed the ladders on their shoulders and went off to Jerusalem. When they reached the guards, the guards said to them: Where are you going? They said to them: We are going to bring down doves from the dovecote that is located down the road before us and with these ladders that are on our shoulders. As soon as they had passed the guards, they dismantled the ladders and took them up to Jerusalem. The name Salmāi alludes to the Hebrew word for ladder, *sulam*.

And about these families who provided these donations and others like them, the verse says: “The memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing” (Proverbs 10:7), as they are remembered for the good throughout the generations. And about Jeroboam, son of Nevat, and his ilk, it is stated: “But the name of the wicked shall rot” (Proverbs 10:7).

§ The mishna taught: On the twentieth of Av, 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 Moabite 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^N ben Yehuda, who was called Adin. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. 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 Yehuda, 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.

לְעוֹלָם רַבֵּי יוֹסֵי, וְתַרְי תַּנְאֵי אֶלְיָבָא
דְּרַבֵּי יוֹסֵי.

The Gemara answers: **Actually**, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei,ⁿ 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.

”בְּאַחַד בְּטַבַּת לֹא הָיָה בּוֹ מַעֲמֵד,”
כּוּ'. אָמַר לָהּ מֶרְקָשִׁישָׁא בְּרֵיהּ דְּרַב
חֲסִידָא לְרַב אֲשִׁי:

§ The mishna taught that **on the first of Tevet there was no non-priestly watch at all**, as there was an additional offering, *hallel*, and a wood offering. **Mar Kashisha, son of Rav H̄isda, said to Rav Ashi:**

Actually the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yosei – לְעוֹלָם רַבֵּי יוֹסֵי: *Tosafot* ask: Why doesn't the Gemara answer that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, and that two *tanna'im* reported different versions of his view? This answer would apparently be preferable, as there is a principle that an unattributed mishna follows the opinion of Rabbi Meir. *Tosafot* answer that the Gemara chooses to explain the mishna in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei because, as stated elsewhere, Rabbi Yosei's reasoning is with him, i.e., his opinion is well grounded, and therefore the *halakha* is in accordance with him even against the majority of Sages (see *Eiruvin* 14b).

Others explain simply that it is clear from the *baraitot* that two opinions are ascribed to Rabbi Yosei, whereas there is no basis for the claim that there are conflicting versions of Rabbi Meir's opinion (Maharsha).

Perek IV

Daf 28 Amud b

מַאי שְׁנָא הֲלֵל דְּדַחֵי דִּידֵיהּ, וּמַאי
שְׁנָא מוֹסֵף דְּלֹא דַחֵי דִּידֵיהּ?

What is different about *hallel* that it overrides its own watch,ⁿ i.e., the watch in the morning service, when *hallel* is recited; and what is different about the additional offering, that it does not override its own watch, of the morning service, but it does override the watch of the afternoon service and the closing prayer?

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב אֲשִׁי: הַשְּׁתָּא דְּלֹא
דִּידֵיהּ דַּחֵי, דִּידֵיהּ לֹא כָּל שְׁבִנְיָא אָמַר
לֵיהּ: הֲבֵי קְאָמִינָא לָךְ: לֹא לִידַחֵי
אֶלָּא דִּידֵיהּ!

Rav Ashi said to him: Now, as the additional offering overrides the watch of the afternoon service, which is not its own, is it not all the more so that it should take precedence over its own watch? Rav H̄isda said to Rav Ashi: I meant the opposite, as this is what I am saying to you: It should not take precedence over another watch, that of the closing prayer; rather, let it override only its own watch, the one performed in the additional service.

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אֵיבָא רַבֵּי יוֹסֵי דְּקָאֵי
בְּוֹתָךְ. דְּתַנַּי: רַבֵּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמַר: כָּל יוֹם
שֵׁשׁ בּוֹ מוֹסֵף, יֵשׁ בּוֹ מַעֲמֵד. מַעֲמֵד
דְּמַאי? אֵילִימָא מַעֲמֵד דְּשַׁחֲרִית,
הָא תַּנָּא קָמָא נְמִי הֲבֵי קָאֵמַר. אֶלָּא
מַעֲמֵד דְּמוֹסֵף. דִּידֵיהּ נְמִי לֹא דַחֵי?

Rav Ashi said to him: There is Rabbi Yosei, who holds in accordance with your opinion, as it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei says: On any day on which there is an additional offering, there is a non-priestly watch. The Gemara clarifies: To which non-priestly watch is he referring? If we say that Rabbi Yosei means the non-priestly watch of the morning prayer, but the first *tanna* also said this. Rather, Rabbi Yosei must mean the non-priestly watch of the additional prayer. However, this too is problematic; is it possible that the additional offering does not override even its own watch, during the additional service itself?

אֶלָּא דְּמַנְחָה. קָרְבַּן עֲצִים דַּחֵי! אֶלָּא
לֹא דְּנַעֲוִלָה. שְׁמַע מִינָהּ: דִּידֵיהּ דַּחֵי,
דְּלֹא דִּידֵיהּ לֹא דַחֵי. שְׁמַע מִינָהּ.

Rather, Rabbi Yosei must be referring to the watch of the afternoon prayer. However, this is also puzzling, for if the wood offering overrides the watch of the afternoon service, the additional offering should certainly take precedence over it. Rather, is it not the case that Rabbi Yosei is speaking of the watch in the closing prayer? One can learn from this that the additional offering overrides its own watch, but it does not override a watch that is not its own. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this that this is the case.

NOTES

What is different about *hallel* that it overrides its own watch – מַאי שְׁנָא הֲלֵל דְּדַחֵי דִּידֵיהּ: With regard to the cancellation of the watch assemblies on days of special joy, several fundamental questions arise in connection with this passage. The first issue concerns the correct version of the mishna.

According to the standard texts and most early commentaries, Rabbi Akiva initially maintained that on a day with an additional offering there was no watch in the closing prayer, and when there was a wood offering there was no watch in the afternoon service. Later, Rabbi Akiva reversed his opinion in favor of ben Azzai's ruling. Conversely, according to the *ge'onim* and some early commentaries, Rabbi Akiva's earlier and later opinions were precisely the opposite. The Gemara here assumes that on a day with a wood offering there is no watch in the afternoon service, an opinion that can be reconciled

with Rabbi Akiva's final ruling only according to the reading of the *ge'onim*.

The early commentaries disagree as to why *hallel*, the additional offering, and the wood offering affect the various watch gatherings. According to Rashi, *Tosafot*, and others, the watch assemblies were canceled because there was no time to conduct them on those days. For example, on days when *hallel* was recited, it would be too much to conduct watch assemblies in the morning service as well.

The early commentaries further ask: Why should the additional offering sacrificed in Jerusalem cancel the watch gatherings conducted throughout Eretz Yisrael? Moreover, why should the wood offerings brought by specific families interfere with the assemblies conducted by the members of the watch? Some argue that the additional offering canceled the watch only

for those members who were present in the Temple for the sacrificial service (Ritva).

Similarly, others maintain that the wood offering negated the watch only for the members of the family who brought the offering (Ra'avad). The *ge'onim* offer an entirely different explanation: The watch assemblies were canceled to grant distinction to those days on which *hallel* was recited, or an additional offering or a wood offering was brought. Consequently, the watch gatherings were canceled even outside of Jerusalem. An extreme opinion is that the watch assemblies were canceled only outside of Jerusalem because these assemblies were conducted only outside the capital (Rid).

The early commentaries further disagree about what exactly was canceled, whether it was the Torah reading, the special supplications, or the entire assembly.

The *hallel* recited on a New Moon is not required by Torah law – הלילא דברישי ירחא לא דאורייתא – One should not infer from this statement that the celebration of Hanukkah is an obligation imposed by Torah law. Rather, the recitation of *hallel* on Hanukkah is a Torah obligation, as there is an obligation to recite *hallel* whenever the Jewish people are miraculously delivered from an impending calamity (see *Pesachim* 117a), and the miracle of Hanukkah certainly warrants *hallel*. Conversely, the recitation of *hallel* on the New Moon is a custom, as the New Moon is neither classified as a Festival, nor does it commemorate a miracle performed for the Jewish people (Rabbeinu Yehonatan).

Rav happened to come to Babylonia – רב איקלע לביבלי – According to the plain meaning of this story, Rav was unfamiliar with the custom of reciting *hallel* on the New Moon, which was performed only in Babylonia, not in Eretz Yisrael, Rav's place of origin.

Some suggest that it became customary in Babylonia to recite *hallel* on the New Moon to distinguish between that day and ordinary days. However, in Eretz Yisrael there was no need to take any steps to stress the unique aspects of the day, as the New Moon was proclaimed in Eretz Yisrael, and the additional offering was sacrificed in Jerusalem when the Temple was standing (*Sefer Hashlama*; Meiri).

Others explain that it was customary to recite *hallel* on the New Moon even in Eretz Yisrael; however, different sections of *hallel* were omitted there. When Rav went to Babylonia and observed that the people were reciting *hallel* on the New Moon without making the omissions that were familiar to him, he thought that they were reciting the complete *hallel* and he was about to stop them. But when he saw that the Babylonians also left out certain sections of *hallel*, he withdrew his objection, as he realized that they knew that the recitation of *hallel* on the New Moon was not ordained by Torah law or by rabbinic enactment, but was only a custom.

An individual should not begin – יחיד לא יתחיל – The early commentaries disagree over the meaning of this *baraita*. Some explain that even in a place where it is customary to recite *hallel* on the New Moon, this applies only to a congregational worship, whereas an individual should not recite *hallel* on the New Moon. However, if he has already recited the blessing, he should finish the abridged form of *hallel*, so that the blessing would not have retroactively been recited in vain (*ge'onim*).

Others maintain that in places where it is customary to recite *hallel* on the New Moon, it may be recited even by an individual. According to the Rif and many other early commentaries, the *baraita* means that an individual should not recite *hallel* on the New Moon with a blessing, but if he began to recite *hallel* with a blessing he should complete his recitation. Opinions differ as to whether one should recite the concluding blessing.

Yet others explain that there is no difference whatsoever between an individual and a congregation with regard to the *hallel* recited on the New Moon, as even an individual recites *hallel* with a blessing. The *baraita* here is not referring to the *hallel* recited on the New Moon, but to the *hallel* recited by an individual in commemoration of a private miracle performed on his behalf. This individual should not recite *hallel* with a blessing, but if he began with a blessing, he should finish his recitation with a blessing (Rabbeinu Tam).

וליתני נמי: באחד בניסן לא היה בו מעמד, מפני שיש בו הלל וקרוב מוסף וקרוב עיצים! אמר רבא: זאת אומרת הלילא דברישי ירחא לא דאורייתא.

דאמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי שמעון בן יהוּצָדָק: שמונה עשר יום בשנה יחיד גומר בהן את הלל, ואלו הן: שמונת ימי החג, ושמונת ימי חנוכה, ויום טוב הראשון של פסח, ויום טוב של עצרת. ובגולה, עשרים ואחד יום, ואלו הן: תשעת ימי החג, ושמונת ימי חנוכה, ושני ימים הראשונים של פסח, ושני ימים טובים של עצרת.

רב איקלע לביבלי, חזיניהו דקא קרו הלילא ברישי ירחא. סבר לאפסוקיניהו. כיון דחזא דקא מדלגי דלוגי, אמר: שמע מינה: מנהג אבותיהם בידיהם. תנא: יחיד לא יתחיל, ואם התחיל, גומר.

”חמשה דברים אירעו את אבותינו בשבעה עשר בתמוז, וכו’. נשתברו הלוחות. מנלן? דתנא: בששה לחדש ניתנו עשרת הדברות לישראל. רבי יוסי אומר: בשבעה בו. מאן דאמר בששה ניתנו, בששה ניתנו ובשבעה עלה משה.”

מאן דאמר בשבעה, בשבעה ניתנו ובשבעה עלה משה, דכתיב: ויקרא אל משה ביום השביעי. וכתוב: ויבא משה בתוך הענן ויעל אל ה'ה, ויהי משה בהר ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה. עשרים וארבעה דסין ושייתסר דתמוז מלו להו ארבעין.

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 lawⁿ but is a custom.**

As Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehozadak: **On eighteen days a year,^h 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,ⁿ where he saw that they were reciting *hallel* on a New Moon.^h 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 beginⁿ 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 Tammuz, 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.

HALAKHA

Eighteen days a year – שמונה עשר יום בשנה: There are eighteen days each year on which there is an obligation to recite the entire *hallel*: The eight days of *Sukkot*, the eight days of Hanukkah, the first day of Passover, and *Shavuot*. In the Diaspora, where a second day of each Festival is observed, *hallel* is completed on twenty-one days per year: The nine days of *Sukkot*, the eight days of Hanukkah, the first two days of Passover, and the two days of *Shavuot* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Megilla VaHanukka* 3:6–7).

Hallel on a New Moon – הלילא ברישי ירחא – On a New Moon, an

abridged version of *hallel* is recited, both by the congregation and an individual. Some authorities maintain that when this *hallel* is recited by the congregation, it is preceded and followed by blessings, whereas no blessings are recited by an individual (Rif). Others contend that no blessings are recited even by a congregation, in accordance with the opinion of the Rambam, whose ruling is accepted in most Sephardic communities. It is noted that the custom of Ashkenazic communities follows the opinion of the Rosh and Rabbeinu Tam, that even an individual recites blessings before and after *hallel* (Rema; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 422:2).

The daily offering was nullified – **בטל התמיד**: 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 (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Ta'anit* 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 – **הובקעה העיר**: 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 – **העמיד צלם בהיכל**: 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 Ari*). 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, Apostemos, who burned a Torah scroll on the same day.

בשיבסר בתמוז נחית, אתא, ותברינהו ללוחות. וכתוב: "וייהי כאשר קרב אל המחנה, וירא את העגל. וישלך מידי את הלחות, וישבר אותם תחת ההר".

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.

"בטל התמיד". גמרא.

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

"הובקעה העיר". בשבעה עשר? והכתוב: "בחדש הרביעי, בתשעה לחדש, ויחזק הרעב בעיר". וכתוב בתריה: "ותבקע העיר", וגו'!

The mishna further taught that on the seventeenth of Tammuz the city walls of Jerusalem were breached.ⁿ 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.

אמר רבא: לא קשיא. כאן בראשונה; כאן בשנייה. דתנא: בראשונה, הובקעה העיר בתשעה בתמוז; בשנייה, בשבעה עשר בו.

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.

"שרף אפוסטמוס את התורה". גמרא.

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

"העמיד צלם בהיכל". מנלן? דכתוב: "וימעת הוסר התמיד, ולתת שקוץ שמים".

The mishna also stated that on the seventeenth of Tammuz Manasseh placed an idol in the Sanctuary.ⁿ 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.

וחד היה? והכתוב: "ועל כנף שקוץ ונפל משמים!" אמר רבא: תרי הון, ונפל חד על חבריה ותבריה ליה לידיה, ואשתכח דהיה כתיב:

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:

Perek IV
Daf 29 Amud a

אנת צבית לחרובי ביתא; ידך אשלימת ליה.

You wantⁿ 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

You want, etc. – **אנת צבית וכו'**: There are numerous readings and interpretations of this cryptic inscription found on the broken idol, while others suggest that it was found on the idol

that remained whole. It is also unclear whether the comment is directed at the other idol or toward God. Most commentaries agree that the idol was suggesting that he will lend a hand in aid of the destruction of the Temple.