

# I.

## BAVLI TRACTATE ROSH HASHANAH CHAPTER ONE

### FOLIOS 2A-22A

#### 1:1

- A. [2a] There are four new years:
- B. (1) the first day of Nisan is the new year for kings and festivals;
- C. (2) the first day of Elul is the new year for tithing cattle.
- D. R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “It is on the first day of Tishré.”
- E. (3) The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years, for Sabbatical years, and for Jubilees,
- F. for planting [trees] and for vegetables;
- G. (4) the first day of Shevat is the new year for trees, in accord with the opinion of the House of Shammai.
- H. The House of Hillel say, “On the fifteenth day of that month [is the new year for trees].”

**I.1** A. [The first day of Nisan is the new year] for kings [M. **R.H. 1:1B**]—

- B. *What is the purpose of this rule?*
- C. Said Rav Hisda, “It is because of legal documents. *For we have taught on Tannaite authority* [M. **Sheb. 10:5**]: **Antedated bonds are invalid, but postdated bonds are valid.**”

**I.2** A. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. [As for] a king who ascended [to the throne] on the 29th of Adar—as soon as the first of Nisan has arrived, a [full] year [in office] is credited to him.
- C. But if he ascended [to the throne] on the first of Nisan [itself]—they do not count a [full] year of his [reign] until the next first of Nisan arrives.
- D. A master said, “‘[As for] a king who ascended [to the throne] on the 29th of Adar—as soon as the first of Nisan has arrived, a [full] year [in office] is credited to him’—
- E. **[2b]** “This teaches us that Nisan is the new year for kings,
- F. “and a single day in the year can be considered a full year.”

- G. But if he ascended [to the throne] on the first of Nisan [itself]—they do not count a [full] year of his [reign] until the next first of Nisan arrives.
- H. *This is obvious [and need not be stated]!*
- I. *No, it is necessary for a case in which they appointed him [to be king] while it was still Adar, [but he did not actually assume the throne until Nisan].*
- J. *[Had A's rule not been taught explicitly] what might we have thought? [Since] they appointed him [before Nisan, once Nisan arrived, it is as though he had been king for] two years! Therefore we are [explicitly] taught [the contrary]. [Even if the king had been appointed to rule some time before, his reign is dated from the beginning of Nisan of the year in which he actually assumed the throne.]*

**I.3 A.** *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. R.H. 1:1]:*

- B. **If [the king] died during Adar, and another king took power in his place during Adar, [in writing legal documents during that same month] they count [the year as the last year in the reign of] this one [who died] or [as the first year in the reign of] that one [who assumed the throne].**
- C. **If [the king] died during Nisan, and another took power in his place during Nisan, [in writing legal documents during that same month] they count [the year as the last year in the reign of] this one [who died] or [as the first year in the reign of] that one [who assumed the throne].**
- D. **If [the king] died during Adar, and another king assumed power in his place during Nisan, they count the former [period, up to Nissan, as the reign of] the first king, and [they count] the latter [period, after the beginning of Nisan, as the reign of] the second king.**
- E. **A master said: If [the king] died during Adar, and another king took power in his place during Adar, [in writing legal documents during that same month] they count [the year as the last year in the reign of] this one [who died] or [as the first year in the reign of] that one [who assumed the throne].**
- F. *This is obvious [and need not be stated]!*
- G. *[No, it is necessary, since, had A's rule not been taught explicitly] what might you have thought? In the middle of a year, we do not [begin to] count [according to the reign of] a second [king]. [To prevent this wrong assumption, at T. R.H. 1:1] we are [explicitly] taught [the contrary].*
- H. **If [the king] died during Nisan, and another took power in his place during Nisan, [in writing legal documents during that same month] they count [the year as the last year in the reign of] this one [who died] or [as the first year in the reign of] that one [who assumed the throne].**
- I. *This is obvious [and need not be stated]!*
- J. *[No, it is necessary, since, had the rule not been taught explicitly] what might you have thought? When we said, "A single day in the year can be considered a full year"—this applies at the end of the year, [so that a king who assumes power at the end of Adar is credited with a full year on the first of Nisan]. But at the beginning of a year we do not apply [this rule, so that a king who dies at the beginning of Nisan does not have the new year count within his reign]. [To prevent this wrong assumption, at T. R.H. 1:1] we are [explicitly] taught [the contrary].*

- K. **If [the king] died during Adar, and another king assumed power in his place during Nisan, they count the former [period, up to Nisan, as the reign of] the first king, and [they count] the latter [period, after the beginning of Nisan, as the reign of] the second king.**
- L. *This is obvious [and need not be stated]!*
- M. *No, it is necessary for a case in which they appointed him [to be king] while it was still Adar, and he was the son of the [recently deceased] king. [Had the rule not been explicitly taught] what might you have thought? [Since he inherited immediately upon his father's death, after the beginning of Nisan] they count the second year [of his reign]. [To prevent this wrong assumption, at T. R.H. 1:1] we are [explicitly] taught [the contrary, that the years of his reign are counted only beginning in Nisan, when he actually assumed power].*
- I.4 A.** Said R. Yohanan, "From what verse in Scripture [do we know] concerning kings, that they only count [the years of their reign] from Nisan?"
- B. "For it is said [1Ki. 6: 1]: 'In the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, of Solomon's reign over Israel, [he began to build the house of the Lord].'"
- C. "An analogy is made between the reign of Solomon and the exodus from Egypt.
- D. "Just as the [years from the] exodus from Egypt are [counted] from Nisan, so the [years of the] reign of Solomon are [counted] from Nisan."
- E. *Now, as for the exodus from Egypt itself: How do we know that we date it from Nisan? Perhaps we should date it from Tishré!*
- F. *Do not even think that, since it is written [Num. 33:38]: "And Aaron the priest went up Mount Hor at the command of the Lord, and died there, in the fortieth year after the people of Israel had come out of the land of Egypt, in the fifth month [that is, Ab], on the first day of the month."*
- G. And it is written [Deu. 1: 3]: "And in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month [that is, Shevat], on the first day of the month, Moses spoke [to the people of Israel...]."
- H. *Since [what is described] took place in Ab [which is before Tishré], and it is called the fortieth year, and since [what is described] took place in Shevat [which is after Tishré], and it is called the fortieth year, we may conclude that the new year [in regards to the exodus] does not begin in Tishré.*
- I. *Certainly what [is referred] explicitly [is indicated as being counted] from the exodus from Egypt. But this [incident referred to]: On what basis [do you know that it represents forty years counted] from the exodus from Egypt? Perhaps [it counts] from the construction of the [wilderness] tabernacle, [which took place in the year after the exodus]! [We know that I is correct] on the basis of Rav Pappa's statement: "[The appearance of the expression] 'twentieth year' in two separate passages allows for an analogy based upon verbal congruities." So here I can argue that the two appearances of the term] fortieth year [at Num. 33:38 and Deu. 1: 3] allow for an analogy based upon verbal congruities:*
- J. Just as here [at Num. 33:38, in the case of the death of Aaron, the years are being counted] from the exodus from Egypt, so here [at Deu. 1: 3, in reference to Moses's speech, the years are being counted] from the exodus from Egypt].

- K. *But on what basis [do you conclude that] the incident that took place in Ab [the fifth month, recorded at Num. 33:38, G] occurred first [that is, prior to the incident recorded at Deu. 1: 3, H]? Perhaps the incident that took place in Shevat [the eleventh month, recorded at Deu. 1: 3, above occurred first! [In this scenario, Moses's speech took place before Aaron died. It was counted as taking place in the fortieth year because the fortieth anniversary of the exodus, in Tishré, already had passed.]*
- L. *Do not even think that, since it is written [Deu. 1: 4, in the continuation of the passage referring to Moses's speech]: "after he had defeated Sihon the king of the Amorites."*
- M. But when Aaron died, Sihon in fact was still alive. [Clearly, then, the event recorded in Deu. 1: 4 happened after Aaron's death, reported at Num. 33:38.]
- N. [We know that Sihon was alive when Aaron died] since it is written [Num. 21: 1]: **[3a]** "When the Canaanite, the king of Arad, [who dwelt in the Negeb], heard [that Israel was coming by the way of Atharim...]."
- O. What report did he hear?
- P. He heard that Aaron had died and that the clouds of glory had left [the people of Israel]. He therefore determined that it now was permitted to fight against [the people of] Israel.
- Q. *And this is as it is written [Num. 20:29]: "And all the congregation saw that Aaron was dead..."*
- R. Now, said R. Abbahu, "At [Num. 20:29] do not read 'saw.' Rather [by adding one letter, read it as], 'were seen.'" [That is, once the clouds of glory departed, the Israelites became visible to their enemies.]
- S. [This reading is] in accordance with Resh Laqish, for said Resh Laqish, "'Ki' [the following word in the verse, translated as 'that'] has four [additional] meanings: 'if,' 'perhaps,' 'but,' and 'since.'" [Hence, the verse may be read: And all the congregation were seen, since Aaron was dead....]
- T. *Is this an appropriate proof [that Sihon was alive when Aaron died]? There [at Num. 21: 1] reference is to Canaan, while here [at Deu. 1: 4 we speak of] Sihon!*
- U. *[To resolve this problem, we recall that] it is taught on Tannaite authority: Sihon, Arad, and Canaan all refer to the same individual. [He was called] Sihon, since he resembled a sayyah [that is, a foal] in the wilderness. [He was called] Canaan after his nation. And what was his [given] name? His name was Arad.*
- V. There are those who say: [He was called] Arad because he resembled an arad [that is, wild ass] of the wilderness. [He was called] Canaan after his nation. And what was his [given] name? His name was Sihon.

**I.5 A.** *Now, might I not reason [that] new year is in Iyyar, [the second month]?*

- B. *Do not even think such a thing, since it is written [Exo. 40:17]: "And in the first month [that is, Nisan], in the second year, on the first day of the month, the tabernacle was erected."*

- C. *And it is [further] written [Num. 10:11]: “And in the second year, in the second month [that is, Iyyar, on the twentieth day of the month], the cloud was taken up from over the tabernacle of the testimony.”*
- D. *[Insofar as], when speaking of [the construction of the tabernacle, in] Nisan, [Exo. 40:17] calls it the second year, and when speaking of [the removal of the cloud, which took place immediately thereafter, in] Iyyar, [Num. 10:11 still] calls it the second year, this proves that new year is not in Iyyar. [If it were, the event reported at Num. 10:11 would have been described as taking place at the beginning of the third year.]*
- E. *Then might I not reason [that] new year is in Sivan, [the third month]?*
- F. *Do not even think such a thing, since it is written [Exo. 19: 1]: “On the third new moon after the people of Israel had gone forth out of the land of Egypt, [on that day they came into the wilderness of Sinai].”*
- G. *Now, if [new year] were in the third month, [Exo. 19: 1 would have indicated that they had entered the wilderness of Sinai], “in the second year after [the people of Israel] had gone forth [out of the land of Egypt].”*
- H. *But why not propose [that new year is in] Tamuz [the fourth month], Ab [the fifth month], or Adar [the twelfth month]? [Ab and Shevat are the fifth and eleventh months of the same year. This proves that new year does not occur in any of the intervening months.]*
- I. *Rather [to reject A’s proposal entirely], said R. Eleazar, “[We learn that new year is in Nisan] from this verse [2Ch. 3: 2, referring to Solomon’s building of the Jerusalem-Temple]: ‘He began to build in the second month, in the second, of the fourth year of his reign.’*
- J. *“What is the meaning of ‘in the second’?*
- K. *“Is it not the second month, by which his reign is counted?*
- L. *Rabina objected to this: “Let me rather argue that [it refers to] the second day of the month.”*
- M. *If that were the case, [Scripture] would have stated explicitly, “On the second day of the month.”*
- N. *Then I might rather argue [that reference is to] the second day of the week!*
- O. *This [is unacceptable] since [in Scripture] we never find it written, “the second day of the week.”*
- P. *And, further, one must make an analogy between the second and first occurrences of [the word] “second.” Just as the first occurrence of the word “second” refers to a month, so the second occurrence of the word “second” must refer to a month.*
- I.6 A.** *A Tannaite teaching concurs with R. Yohanan: From what verse in Scripture [do we know] concerning kings, that they only count [the years of their reign] from Nisan?*
- B. *For it is said [1Ki. 6: 1]: “In the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt [in the fourth year, in the month of Ziv, which is the second month, of Solomon’s reign over Israel, [he began to build the house of the Lord].”*

- C. And it is written [Num. 33:38]: “And Aaron the priest went up Mount Hor at the command of the Lord, [and died there, in the fortieth year after the people of Israel had come out of the land of Egypt, in the fifth month (that is, Ab), on the first day of the month].”
- D. And it is written [Deu. 1: 3]: “And in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month [(that is, Shevat), on the first day of the month, Moses spoke to the people of Israel...].”
- E. And it is written [Deu. 1: 4, in the continuation of the passage referring to Moses’s speech]: “after he had defeated Sihon [the king of the Amorites].”
- F. And it says [Num. 21: 1]: “When the Canaanite, [the king of Arad, who dwelt in the Negeb], heard [that Israel was coming by the way of Atharim...].”
- G. And it says [Num. 20:29]: “And all the congregation saw that Aaron was dead....”
- H. And it says [Exo. 40:17]: “And in the first month [that is, Nisan], in the second year, [on the first day of the month, the tabernacle was erected].”
- I. And it says [Num. 10:11]: “And in the second year, in the second month [(that is, Iyyar) on the twentieth day of the month, the cloud was taken up from over the tabernacle of the testimony].”
- J. And it says [Exo. 19: 1]: “On the third new moon after the people of Israel had gone forth [out of the land of Egypt, on that day they came into the wilderness of Sinai].”
- K. And it says [2Ch. 3: 2]: “He began to build [in the second month, in the second, of the fourth year of his reign].”

- I.7 A.** Said R. Hisda, “They taught [that Nisan is the new year for kings] only for the case of Israelite kings.
- B. “But in the case of kings of other nations, we count [the years of their reign] from Tishré,
- C. “as it is stated [Neh. 1: 1]: ‘The words of Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah. Now it happened in the month of Kislev, in the twentieth year....’;
- D. “and it is written [Neh. 2: 1]: ‘In the month of Nisan, in the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes....’
- E. *“[Insofar as], when speaking of Kislev, [Neh. 1: 1] calls it the twentieth year, and when speaking of Nisan, [Neh. 2: 1 still] calls it the twentieth year, this proves that new year [for non-Israelite kings] is not in Nisan.” [If it were, the event reported at Neh. 2: 1 would have been described as taking place at the beginning of the twenty-first year.]*
- F. *Granted that [Neh. 2: 1] refers explicitly to Artaxerxes. But how do you know that [Neh. 1: 1 also] refers to [the reign of] Artaxerxes? Perhaps [3b] it refers to some other enumeration [entirely]! [If this is the case, no conclusions may be drawn from these verses regarding the new year for non-Israelite kings.]*
- G. *Said R. Pappa, “[The appearance of the expression] ‘twentieth year’ in two separate passages allows for an analogy based upon verbal congruities. Just as there [at Neh 2: 1] reference is to Artaxerxes, so here [at Neh. 1: 1] reference is to Artaxerxes.”*
- H. *But on what basis [do you conclude that] the incident that took place in Kislev [recorded at Neh. 1: 1] occurred first [that is, prior to what is recorded at*



*Neh. 2: 1]? Perhaps the incident that took place in Nisan [which is reported at Neh. 2: 1] occurred first! [In this scenario, the twentieth year indeed commenced with Nisan, as indicated at Neh. 2: 1. What is reported at Neh. 1: 1 took place later on, in Kislev of that year.]*

- I. Do not even think that, since it taught on Tannaite authority: The things Hanani told Nehemiah in Kislev, [Nehemiah in turn] told the king in Nisan.
- J. “The things Hanani told Nehemiah in Kislev”—this is as it is written [Neh. 1: 1-3]: “The words of Nehemiah the son of Hacaliah. Now it happened in the month of Kislev in the twentieth year, while I was in Susa the capital, that Hanani, one of my brethren, came with certain men out of Judah. Now, I asked them concerning the Jews that survived, who had escaped exile, and concerning Jerusalem. And they said to me, ‘The survivors there in the province who escaped exile are in great trouble and shame. The wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and its gates are destroyed by fire.’” [Nehemiah in turn] told the king in Nisan”—this is as it is written [Neh. 2: 1-6]: “In the month of Nisan, in the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes, when wine was before him, I took up the wine and gave it to the king. Previously I had not been sad in his presence. And the king said to me, ‘Why is your face sad, since you are not sick? This is nothing other than a sadness of the heart.’ Then I was very much afraid and said to the king, ‘Let the king live for ever! Why should not my face be sad when the city, the place of my fathers’ sepulchers, lies waste, and its gates have been destroyed by fire?’ Then the king said to me, ‘What do you request?’ So I prayed to the God of heaven and said to the king, ‘If it pleases the king, and if your servant has found favor in your sight, [I request] that you send me to Judah, to the city of my fathers’ sepulchers, that I may rebuild it.’ And the king said to me, the queen sitting beside him, ‘How long will you be gone, and when will you return?’ So it pleased the king to send me, and I set him a time.”
- K. *R. Joseph proposed [yet another] challenge [to the theory, that the reigns of non-Israelite kings are counted from Tishré, the seventh month]: “[Hag. 1:15 states], ‘On the twenty-fourth day of the month, in the sixth month, in the second year of Darius the king.’ And it is written [in the following verse, Hag. 2: 1], ‘In the seventh month, on the twenty-first day of the month, [the word of the Lord came by Haggai the prophet].’ [Since Scripture does not explicitly state the year, we assume that it intends the second, referred to in the preceding verse, Hag. 1:15.] Now, if [the new year for non-Israelite kings in fact] is [Tishré, the event referred to at Hag. 2: 1] would be in the seventh month of the third year!”*
- L. Said R. Abbahu, “Cyrus was a worthy king. Therefore they counted [the years of] his [reign] like those of the kings of Israel.” [The example of Cyrus thus is unique and does not disprove the contention.]
- M. *R. Joseph challenged this: “For one thing, if it is as you state, two Scriptural passages are contradictory: [Ezr. 6:15 reads]: ‘And this house was finished on the third day of the month of Adar, in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king.’ And [concerning this verse] it is taught on Tannaite authority: At that same time in the following year, Ezra went up from Babylon along with his group of exiles. And it is written [Ezr. 7: 8]: ‘And he came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king.’ Now, if it is [as you say, that*

*the reigns of non-Israelite kings are counted from Tishré], this would be the eighth year. And for another thing, what is the relationship [between your proposal and the verses cited]? There [at Neh. 1:15-2:1 reference is to] Cyrus, while here [in your challenge to the conclusion based upon Neh. 1:15-2:1, reference is to] Darius.” [The fact that Cyrus is treated as an Israelite king has nothing to do with the counting of the years of Darius’s reign. On the basis of that counting, we know that the reigns of non-Israelite kings, like those of Israelites, are counted from Nisan.]*

- N. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority: Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes are all the same individual. [He was called] Cyrus since he was a worthy king; Artaxerxes after the name of his empire; and what was his [given] name? Darius. It follows that, one way or another, there is a problem!*
- O. *Said R. Isaac, “There is no contradiction. Here [in the verses from Haggai, reference is to the period] before [Cyrus] became wicked, [while] here [in the verses from Ezra, reference is to the period] after [Cyrus] became wicked.” [In the former period, Cyrus was treated like an Israelite king and therefore was not subject to the usual rule. But in the latter period, he was treated like all non-Israelite kings, whose reigns are numbered from Tishré, just as A-B originally proposed.]*
- P. *Rav Kahana objected, “Did [Cyrus] in fact become wicked? But [indicating the contrary] thus it is written [Ezra 6: 9, recording Cyrus’s decree regarding the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple]: [4a] ‘And whatever is needed—young bulls, rams, or sheep for burnt offerings to the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, or oil, as the priests at Jerusalem require—let that be given to them day by day without fail.’*
- Q. *Said to him R. Isaac, “Rabbi, I borrow from your own argument: [The continuation of Ezr. 6:10, reads]: ‘...that they may offer pleasing sacrifices to the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and his sons.’” [The implication is that Cyrus acted for his own benefit, not for the sake of God. In this way, he had indeed become wicked.]*
- R. *But is not acting in this way still meritorious? For so we have taught on Tannaite authority: [As for] one who says, “This sela is [given] for charity, so that my sons may live, and so that I may merit a place in the coming world”—lo, this person is in every respect righteous.*
- S. *This [precept] applies to an Israelite, while this [ruling applies to an idol worshipper. [We conclude that Cyrus really did become wicked, which explains the distinct ways in which his reign was counted. Accordingly the original contention stands. The reigns of non-Israelite kings normally are counted from Tishré. Only during the period that he acted meritoriously was Cyrus’s reign counted from Nisan, like the reigns of Israelite kings.]*
- T. *And it you wish, I can argue: From what Scriptural verse do we know that [Cyrus] became wicked? For it is written [Ezr. 6: 4, which cites Cyrus’s edict indicating how the Jerusalem-Temple is to be rebuilt]: “with three courses of great stones and one course of new timber; let the cost be paid from the royal treasury.” Why did he want it done this way, [including timber in the construction]? He reasoned: If the Jews rebel against me, I can burn it down!*



- U. *But [in building the Temple] did Solomon not do the same? For thus it is written [1Ki. 6:36]: “He built the inner court with three courses of hewn stone and one course of cedar beams.”*
- V. *[The difference is that] Solomon place [the wood] on top, whereas the other [that is, Cyrus] placed it on the bottom; Solomon sunk it in the building, whereas the other did not sink it in the building; Solomon plastered over it, whereas the other did not plaster over it.*
- I.8 A.** *Said R. Joseph, and some say R. Isaac, “From what Scriptural verse do we know that [Cyrus] became wicked? From here [Neh. 2: 6]: ‘And the king said to me, the shegel sitting beside him....’”*
  - B. *What is the meaning of “shegel”?*
  - C. *Said Rabbah bar Lema in the name of Rab, “A female dog.”*
  - D. *But, if so, thus it is written [Dan. 5:23]: “But you have lifted up yourself against the Lord of heaven; and the vessels of his house have been brought in before you, and you and your lords, your shegel, and your concubines have drunk wine from them.” If shegel means female dog—does a female dog drink wine?*
  - E. *There is no problem, since [we can assume that Dan. 5:23 refers to a case in which] they trained it [to drink wine].*
  - F. *Rather [one can challenge the notion that shegel means female dog] on this basis [Psa. 45:10, referring to the Israelite king]: “daughters of kings are among your ladies of honor; at your right hand stands the shegel in gold of Ophir.” Now, if shegel means female dog, what is the prophet trying to tell [the people of] Israel?*
  - G. *This is what he is saying: Since the Torah is as dear to [the people of] Israel as a shegel is to the idol worshippers, you [Israelites] have earned the gold of Ophir.*
  - H. *But if you wish, I can argue [that], in fact, shegel means queen, but Rabbah bar Lema knew a [particular] teaching [that, for the case of Cyrus, the term referred to a female dog]. And why was [this dog] called “shegel”? For she was as dear to him as a queen. Similarly, [it was because] he had her sit in the queen’s place.*
  - I. *And if you wish, I can argue: From what Scriptural verse do we know that [Cyrus] became wicked? From here [Ezr. 7:21-22: “And I, Artaxerxes the king, make a decree to all the treasurers in the province Beyond the River: Whatever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, requires of you, be it done with all diligence], up to a hundred talents of silver, a hundred kors of wheat, a hundred baths of wine, a hundred baths of oil, and salt without prescribing how much.” Initially, he placed no limit [on how much could be spent], but now he placed a limit.*
  - J. *But perhaps at first he had not decided upon the limit, [even though he intended all along to have a limit]? Rather, the best explanation [for how we know that Cyrus became wicked] is the one we taught first.*

**II.1 A.** **[The first day of Nisan is the new year for kings] and festivals [M. R.H. 1:1B].**

- B. Is [new year] for festivals [indeed] on the first of Nisan?
- C. [Certainly] it is [rather] on the fifteenth of Nisan. [The fifteenth of Nisan is the first day of Passover, which is the first festival in the liturgical year.]
- D. Said Rav Hisda, “[M. **R.H. 1:1B** means that] the festival that is in it [that is, Nisan] is the new year for festivals.”

## **The Special Problem of Improperly Postponing the Fulfillment of Vows beyond the Passage of the Year in which They Are Taken**

- II.2** A. *This [rule, M. **R.H. 1:1B**] has implications for determination of the point at which one who makes a vow has transgressed [Deu. 23:22’s precept that one] not delay [fulfilling his obligation].*
- B. *And this [follows the perspective of] R. Simeon, for it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. **R.H. 1:2**]:*
  - C. **All the same are one who vows, one who pledges a Valuation, and one who consecrates an object [but has not yet carried out what he has said]. One violates the law against postponing the keeping of one’s obligation only once the festivals of an entire year have gone by.**
  - D. **R. Simeon says, “[This is so in the case of] three festivals in their proper sequence, with the festival of unleavened bread coming first.”**
  - E. **And so would R. Simeon say, “Sometimes they are three, sometimes they are four, and sometimes they are five.**
  - F. **“How so?**
  - G. **“If one vowed before Passover, [he violates the law after] three [festivals have passed: Passover, Pentecost, and the Festival].**
  - H. **“[If he vowed] before Pentecost, [he violates the law only after] five [festivals have passed: Pentecost, the Festival, Passover, Pentecost, and the Festival].**
  - I. **“[If he vowed] before the Festival, [he violates the law only after] four [festivals have passed: the Festival, Passover, Pentecost, and the Festival].”**
- II.3** A. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. **Ar. 3:17**, with variations in the order of the entries]:*
- B. **Those who owe the assessment of an object to be redeemed and Valuations, things that have been declared *herem* and things that have been declared sanctified, sin offerings and guilt offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, gifts of charity and tithes, firstlings and tithe of cattle and the Passover, [4b] gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and that which is left growing in the corner of a field—one violates the law against postponing the keeping of one’s obligation only once the festivals of an entire year have gone by.**
  - C. **[T. **Ar. 3:18**: R. Simeon says, “[This is so in the case of] three festivals in their proper sequence, with the festival of unleavened bread coming first.”**
  - D. **[Disagreeing] R. Meir says, “One violates the law against postponing the keeping of one’s obligation as soon as one festival has gone by.”**
  - E. **[Disagreeing] R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, “One violates the law against postponing the keeping of one’s obligation as soon as two festivals have gone by.”**

- F. [T. Ar. 3:18]: R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “One violates the law against postponing the keeping of one’s obligation as soon as the festival of Tabernacles passes by.”
- G. *What is the reasoning of the first Tannaite authority [at B]?*
- H. [The following refers to Deu. 16, which describes the festival calendar and states, vs. 16: “Three times a year all your males shall appear before the Lord your God at the place which he will choose.”] *Since the [Scriptural] discussion takes place in the context of [a description of the three festivals], why does it need to repeat itself and write [Deu. 16:16]: “at the feast of unleavened bread, at the feast of weeks, and at the feast of booths. [They shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed]”? Learn from this the precept of not delaying [payment of one’s obligations]!*
- J. Now, R. Simeon says, “[Deu. 16:16] need not have referred [by name] to the festival of Tabernacles, since the Scriptural passage [in which Deu. 16:16 is found already] is talking about [Tabernacles, at Deu. 16:13-15]. Why [then] is [Tabernacles explicitly] mentioned [at Deu. 16:16]? To teach that, [in the sequence of festivals, Tabernacles] is last, [coming after Passover and Pentecost].”
- K. *But [as for] R. Meir—what is his reasoning [for requiring only one festival to pass]?*
- L. *As it is written [Deu. 12: 5-6]: “[But you shall seek the place which the Lord your God will choose...;] thither you shall go, and thither you shall bring [your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, etc.].”*
- M. *But [how do the] Rabbis understand this verse]?*
- N. *It is a positive commandment. [Deu. 12: 5-6 indicates what one should do. But one who does not has not violated the restriction against delaying.]*
- O. *But [in the view of] R. Meir—Since the Merciful told him to bring [what he owes], and he did not bring it, has as immediately transgressed the rule regarding delaying.*
- P. *But [as for] R. Eliezer b. Jacob—what is his reasoning [for requiring two festivals to pass]?*
- Q. For it is written [Num. 29:39]: “These you shall offer to the Lord at your appointed feasts, [in addition to your votive offerings and your freewill offerings, for your burnt offerings, and for your cereal offerings, and for your drink offerings, and for your peace offerings].” [Eliezer b. Jacob argues that] the smallest [number of festivals that can be referred to by the plural] “appointed feasts” is two.
- R. *But [how do the] Rabbis understand this verse]?*
- S. *This [plural, “appointed feasts”] accords with [the interpretation proposed by] R. Jonah. For R. Jonah said, “All of the appointed feasts were put on the same footing, to show that they all atone for the uncleanness of the sanctuary and its holy things.”*
- T. *But [as for] R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon—what is his reasoning [for requiring that Tabernacles pass by]?*
- U. *As it is taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon says, “[Deu. 16:16] need not have referred [by name] to the festival of Tabernacles, since the Scriptural passage [in which Deu. 16:16 is found already] is talking about*

[Tabernacles, at Deu. 16:13-15]. Why [then] is [Tabernacles explicitly] mentioned [at Deu. 16:16]? To teach that this [specific festival] is determinative.”

- V. *Now, [as for] R. Meir and R. Eliezer b. Jacob—this [verse, Deu. 16:16]: “at the feast of unleavened bread, at the feast of weeks, and at the feast of booths”—how do they interpret it?*
- W. *They use it [for the same purpose] as R. Eleazar said [in the name of R.] Oshaia. For said R. Eleazar said R. Oshaia, “From what Scriptural verse [do we know that a sacrifice omitted on] Pentecost can be made up for on the [following] seven days? Scripture says: ‘at the feast of unleavened bread, at the feast of weeks, and at the feast of booths.’ This equates the festival of Pentecost with the feast of unleavened bread. Just as [a sacrifice omitted on] the feast of unleavened bread can be made up for on the [following] seven days, so a sacrifice omitted on] Pentecost can be made up for on the [following] seven days.”*
- X. *But [instead] one should equate [the festival of Pentecost] with the festival of Tabernacles! [The result would be to say that] just as that [festival, Tabernacles] has eight days on which a missed offering can be made up, so this [festival, Pentecost] should have eight days, [not the seven suggested at E-F].*
- Y. *The eighth day [of Tabernacles] is an independent festival.*
- Z. *I can say that we hold that the eighth day [of Tabernacles] is an independent festival in regard to (1) casting lots [to determine which priestly course will officiate]; (2) [reciting the benediction thanking God for bringing us to this] time; (3) [the name of the] festival, [that is, Aseret, not Tabernacles]; (4) the [festival] offering; (5) the psalm [chanted by the Levites]; (6) the blessing [for the king; 1Ki. 8:66]. But as for making up [for a missed sacrifice], all agree [a sacrifice missed on] the first day may be made up on it. [This is] as it is taught on Tannaite authority [M. Hag. 1:6]: **He who did not make a festal offering on the first festival day of Tabernacles makes festal offerings throughout the entire festival, including the last festival day of the Festival [of Tabernacles].***
- AA. *If you grasp a lot, you will not [successfully] grasp [it all]; but if you grasp a little, you can grasp it.*
- BB. *[If, as we have seen, Deu. 16:16 does not indicate that Pentecost and Tabernacles are comparable], for what purpose did the Merciful include [in that verse reference to] the festival of Tabernacles?*
- CC. *It is to equate it with the festival of Passover. [5a] Just as, on the festival of Passover [the celebrant] must stay overnight [in Jerusalem], so on the festival of Tabernacles [the celebrant] must stay overnight [in Jerusalem].*
- DD. *Now, there [in the case of Passover] from what verse do we know [that the celebrant must stay overnight in Jerusalem]?*
- EE. *As it is written [Deu. 16: 7, referring to the paschal offering], “[And you shall boil it and eat it at the place which the Lord your God will choose]; and in the morning you shall turn and go to your tents.” [The implication is that the individual must stay in Jerusalem, at the place of the sacrifice, throughout the night.]*
- FF. *But [as for] the first [cited] Tannaite authority and R. Simeon [both of whom depend upon Deu. 16:16 to derive the prohibition against delaying payment of*

*one's obligations]—from where do they derive [the right] to make up [for a missed sacrifice] on Pentecost?*

- GG. *They derive it from that which Rabbah bar Samuel taught on Tannaite authority. For it is taught on Tannaite authority: Rabbah bar Samuel said, “The Torah said: Count the days and sanctify the new month. [Reference is to Num. 11:19-20: ‘You shall not eat [meat] one day, or two days, or five days, or ten days, or twenty days, but a whole month.’ The verse is taken to suggest that months are counted a day at a time. The actual sanctification is accomplished through a sacrifice (Num. 28:11).] [Comparably, the Torah states]: Count days and sanctify the festival of Pentecost. [Reference is to Lev. 23:15: ‘And you shall count from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that you brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven full weeks shall they be.’ This suggests that the period to Pentecost is counted by weeks. The sanctification is marked by an offering of grain, Lev. 23:16.] [This suggests that] just as the month is [sanctified] for a period that accords with the unit of time by which it is counted [that is, a day], so the festival of Pentecost is [sanctified] for a period that accords with the unit of time by which it is counted [that is, a week].” [The point is that, since Pentecost is sanctified for a full week, the compensation period is also a week.]*
- HH. *[Following this same argument], should I not state that [the compensation period for] Pentecost is [only] one day?*
- II. *Said Rava, “Is it indeed the case that for Pentecost we count only days, and do not count weeks [as well]? Rather, [indicating that we in fact counts weeks], thus said a master, ‘It is an obligation to count days and an obligation to count weeks.’ And moreover, [at Deu. 16:16] it states, ‘The festival of Pentecost.’*
- JJ. *[At issue is the inclusion at T. Ar. 3:17 of the Passover offering as an item that, after three festivals have passed, is subject to the prohibition against delaying fulfillment of one's ritual obligations.] Now, can the Passover sacrifice be offered on any of the festivals? [Does not] the Passover sacrifice have a fixed time, [the 14th of Nisan, so that] if one offers it [at that time], he has offered it [and fulfilled the obligation], but if he fails to offer it [at that time and offers it instead at a different point], it is rejected? [Indeed this is the case. It therefore appears that the Passover offering does not belong in the list at T. Ar. 3:17. It cannot be brought beyond the 14th of Nisan.]*
- LL. *Said R. Hisda, “Passover [was included in the list incidentally.]”*
- MM. *[Explaining in a different way the appearance of Passover at T. Ar. 3:17] R. Sheshet said, “The Passover offering mentioned there refers to] the peace offering [that one brings in lieu of] a Passover offering.” [See M. Pes. 9:6 and b. Pes. 97b. If a Passover offering is lost and not brought at the appropriate time, a peace-offering is designated in its place. This peace-offering comes under the restriction against delaying and so appropriately is listed at T. Ar. 3:17.]*
- NN. *If [what Sheshet says] is [in fact] the case, then reference is to a peace-offering! [But at T. Ar. 3:17 peace-offerings are listed independently. So the term Passover offering in that list cannot mean peace-offerings. That would be redundant.]*

OO. [T. Ar. 3:17] included peace-offerings brought in place of a Passover offering as well as peace-offerings brought for their own sake. You might have thought that since [the peace-offering] is brought in place of a Passover offering [5b], they deemed it equivalent to a Passover offering [which only may be sacrificed on the 14th of Nisan itself]. Therefore we have been instructed explicitly [at T. Ar. 3:17, that one transgresses the prohibition against delaying only by failing to offer the peace-offering that replaces a Passover offering within a period of a full year after Passover].

**II.4 A.** From what [verse in Scripture] are these rules [at T. Ar. 3:17 derived]?

- B. It is as our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: [Deu. 23:21 states]: “When you make a vow [to the Lord your God, you shall not be slack to pay it; for the Lord your God will surely require it of you, and it would be sin in you].”
- C. [From the beginning of this verse] I only know the rule for a vow.
- D. [As for] a freewill offering—from what [verse in Scripture do I know that it is subject to the same obligation not to delay in paying it]?
- E. Here [at Deu. 23:21] it says, “vow,” and in another place it says [Lev. 7:16]: “If the sacrifice of his offering is a votive offering [using the same word as ‘vow’] or a freewill offering....”
- F. Just as in that other place [Lev. 7:16] the freewill offering is included with it [that is, with the vow], so here [at Deu. 23:21, we imply that] the freewill offering is included with it [and so is subject to the same rule against delaying payment that applies to a vow].
- G. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “To the Lord your God.” This refers to [T. Ar. 3:17]: **the assessment of an object to be redeemed and Valuations, things that have been declared herem and things that have been declared sanctified.**
- H. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “you shall not be slack to pay it.” [This means you must pay] *it* and not its substitute.
- I. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “For [the Lord your God] will surely require it of you.” This refers to [T. Ar. 3:17]: **sin offerings and guilt offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.**
- J. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “The Lord your God.” This refers to **gifts of charity and tithes, and firstlings.**
- K. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “of you.” This refers to **gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and that which is left growing in the corner of a field.**
- L. [Deu. 23:21 continues]: “and it would be sin in you.” [This means that the sin will be attributed to you], but the sin will not be accounted to your offering.



- M. A master said, “[Deu. 23:21 states]: ‘You shall not be slack to pay it.’ [This means you must pay] *it* and not its substitute.”
- N. *To what substitutes [is reference made]? If [reference is to] the substitute of a burnt-offering or peace-offering—these certainly are offered [subject to the restriction against delaying]. [Accordingly, the statement at A cannot apply to these things.] If [reference is to] the substitute of a sin-offering—it is left to die [and cannot be offered at all]. [Accordingly, it would make no sense for the text to exclude this offering from the rule against delaying. Since it cannot be offered, no one would assume that it is subject to that rule.] Therefore, to what substitutes [is reference made]?*
- O. *[Reference is to] the substitute of a thank-offering. For R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority: “[As for] a thank-offering that was [lost, replaced, found, and then] mixed up with its substitute, and [then] one of the offerings died—there is no remedy for the remaining [offering]. What course can the individual follow? To offer it together with the bread [required in the case of a thank-offering]? [This is unacceptable, since] it might be the substitute, [in the case of which the bread is not offered; B. Men. 79b]. [Alternatively, is it possible] to offer it without the bread? [This is unacceptable, since] it might be the [original] thank-offering, [in which case the bread is required].”*
- P. *[Given the circumstance described at G-L, why would the substitute of a thank-offering be covered by Deu. 23:21?] Indeed, since this [substitute] cannot be offered at all, why would I need the verse [at Deu. 23:21] specifically to exclude it [from being subject to the rule against delaying]?*
- Q. *Said R. Sheshet, “In fact, [contrary to C, A’s rule is meant] to exclude [from the restriction against delaying] the substitute of a burnt-offering or peace-offering. And here, with what situation are we concerned? [A case] such as one in which [an individual had designated one of these offerings and, before he offered it] two festivals had passed. Then it developed an [invalidating] blemish and [the owner] deconsecrated it by substituting it with a different [animal], after which another festival passed [without the substitute’s being offered]. You might think that, since this [substitute] comes as a replacement for the prior [animal], it is as though three festival have passed, [so that the individual is guilty of violating the restriction against delaying]. So we are informed, [that the substitute of the burnt-offering or*

*peace-offering is not subject to the restriction against delaying based upon time at which the original offering was designated].”*

- R. *But according to R. Meir, who says [that] as soon as one festival has passed, he has violated the restriction against delaying, what can one say?*
- S. *Said Rava, “Here [taking account of Meir’s view], with what situation are we dealing? [With a case] such as one in which [the offering] developed an invalidating blemish before a first festival [had passed], and [the owner] deconsecrated it by substituting it with a different [animal], after which a festival passed. You might think that, since this [substitute] comes as a replacement for the prior [animal], it is as though it had been kept over the entire [period between one] festival [and the next]. [In this interpretation, the individual now would be guilty of violating (Meir’s interpretation of) the restriction against delaying.] So we are informed, [that the substitute of the burnt-offering or peace-offering is not subject to the restriction against delaying according to the point in time at which the original offering was designated].” [The individual violates the prohibition against delaying only if he fails to offer the animal before a second festival has passed.]*
- T. *[Deu. 23:21 reads]: “And it would be sin in you.” [This means that the sin will be attributed to you], but the sin will not be accounted to your offering. [Hence, the offering still may be used, even after the owner has violated the restriction against delaying.]*
- U. *Is this [conclusion] in fact derived from this [verse]? Certainly [rather] it is derived from [the statement attributed to] “Others.” For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. San. 3:6]: Others say, “Is it possible to suppose that a firstling, the proper time for [the offering of] which has passed after the first year, should be in the status of unfit Holy Things and so be invalid [to be brought to Jerusalem]? Scripture says [Deu. 14:23], ‘And you will eat before the Lord your God the tithe of your grain, wine, and oil, and the firstborn of your herd and flock.’ The text draws an analogy between the firstling and [second] tithe. Just as [second] tithe does not become invalid, [so that it may be brought to Jerusalem and eaten] from one year to the next, so the firstborn does not become invalid [and may be kept] from one year to the next.”*
- V. *[Despite this ruling based upon Deu. 14:23], it was still necessary [to derive this rule from Deu. 23:21]. You might*

*have thought that this conclusion [derived at D-E from Deu. 14:23 applies only to] a firstling, which is not for appeasement; but [in the case of] consecrated things, [such as burnt and sin-offering], which are for appeasement, you might say [that if they are kept over from year to year] they will not appease [and so are invalid]. [The notion that these offerings are for appeasement derives from Lev. 1: 3: "If his offering is a burnt offering from the herd...; he shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting, that he may be accepted before the Lord."] So we are taught [by Deu. 23:21, that the contrary is true]. [Even consecrated things such as burnt and sin-offering may be offered after their appointed time. The owner has violated the restriction against delaying, but the offering itself remains valid.]*

W. *But even so [6a] [I might propose that the interpretation of Deu. 23:21 is unnecessary, insofar as the same conclusion] can be derived from [the statement] of Ben Azzai. [The following is based upon Lev. 7:18: "If any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offering is eaten on the third day, he who offers it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be credited to him." The italicized word "it" is unnecessary and therefore is subject to interpretation.] For it is taught on Tannaite authority: Ben Azzai says, "...it...." Why does Scripture state [this word]? Since it is said [Deu. 23:21]: '[When you make a vow to the Lord your God], you shall not be slack to pay it,' I might reason that even one who delays paying his vow is subject to [the penalty indicated at Lev. 7:18, that] 'he [who offers it] shall not be accepted.' [Therefore Lev. 7:18 needed explicitly to state], '...it....', [meaning] 'it' [that is, a sacrifice left beyond the third day] is subject to [the penalty that] 'he [who offers it] shall not be accepted.' But he who delays fulfilling his vow is not subject to [the penalty that] 'he [who offers it] shall not be accepted.'"]*

X. *Rather [the conclusion of Deu. 23:21], "and it would be sin in you" [means that the sin of delaying payment of a vow is in you] and not in your wife. You might have thought: Since R. Yohanan, and some say R. Eleazar, says, "A man's wife dies only if money is demanded from him and he does not have it, since it says [Pro. 22:27], 'If you have nothing with which to pay, why should your bed be taken from under you?,'"] therefore, for his transgression of "you shall not delay," she also dies. So we are informed [by Deu. 23:21 that this is not the case]. [Only the one who delays payment of the vow is punished for that sin.]*

- II.5 A.** [Deu. 23:23 reads: “That which has passed your lips you shall be careful to perform, and you shall do what you have voluntarily vowed to the Lord your God, a freewill offering that you have stated with your mouth.” The verse is elucidated.] *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* “That which has passed your lips”—this refers to the positive commandments.
- B. “You shall be careful to perform”—this refers to the negative commandments.
- C. “And you shall do”—this is an admonition to a court, that it should compel you to do [what you have vowed].
- D. “What you have voluntarily vowed”—this refers to a vow.
- E. “To the Lord your God”—this refers to sin-offerings, guilt-offerings, burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings.
- F. “A freewill offering”—this refers to [the word’s] literal meaning.
- G. “That you have stated”—this refers to the things sanctified for the repair of the Temple.
- H. “With your mouth”—this refers to charity.
- I. A master said: [As for the interpretation]: “‘That which has passed your lips’—this refers to the positive commandments”—why do I need this?
- J. *[This same point] derives from [Deu. 12: 5-6]:* “[But you shall seek the place which the Lord your God will choose out of all your tribes to put his name and make his habitation there]; thither you shall go, and thither you shall bring [your burnt offerings and your sacrifices...]. [The verse is read to mean: each time you come, you shall bring....]
- K. “‘You shall be careful to perform’—this refers to the negative commandments”—why do I need this?
- L. *[This same point] derives from [Deu. 23:21]:* “[When you make a vow to the Lord your God], you shall not be slack to pay it.”
- M. “‘And you shall do’—this is an admonition to a court, that it should compel you to do [what you have vowed]”—why do I need this?
- N. *[This same point] derives from [Lev. 1: 3]:* “[If his offering is a burnt offering from the herd...]; he shall offer it [at the door of the tent of meeting...].”
- O. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority:* “He shall offer it”—this teaches that they compel him [to offer it].
- P. Is it logical [to claim that they should make him offer it] against his will?
- Q. [Suggesting the contrary, in the continuation of Lev. 1: 3] Scripture states, “That he may be accepted [literally: ‘of his own will’].”
- R. Therefore, how [can they force him]?
- S. They compel him up to the point at which he states, “I wish to do it [of my own accord].”
- T. *[One [set of interpretations applies in a case in which] he said [the vow] but had not yet designated [the animal needed to pay it]. The other [applies when] he had [made the vow and] designated [the required animal] but had not yet offered it.*
- U. *Now [to indicate that in either case, the individual must not delay in fulfilling his word, both Scriptural interpretations] are needed! For if we knew [only the case*

*in which] he said [the vow] but had not yet designated [the animal to pay it, I might believe that] the reason [he is required to pay the vow without delay] is that he has not yet acted on his word. But, [if that is the only case I explicitly know, then, if] he had [made the vow and] designated [the required animal] but had not yet offered it, I might say [that he is not subject to the prohibition against delaying, since, I could argue], wherever [the animal] is, it is in the treasury of the All-Merciful. [To avoid such an incorrect understanding, both interpretations] are needed. Further, if we knew [only the case in which] he had [made the vow and] designated [the required animal] but had not yet offered it, [I might believe that he is subject to the prohibition against delaying], since he is keeping [the animal] with him [instead of completing the required offering]. But [if that is the only case I explicitly know, then, if] he had said [the vow] but had not yet designated [the animal to pay it], I might say [that he is not subject to the prohibition against delaying, since, I could argue], his word alone is of no weight [and has not obligated him to the vow at all]. [To avoid such an incorrect understanding, both interpretations] are needed.*

V. *How can you claim [that reference is to a situation in which] he had said [the vow] but had not yet designated [the animal to pay it]? For [at Deu. 23:23 the term] “freewill offering” is written. [An individual is not responsible for a freewill offering that dies or is stolen. This suggests that there is no act of obliging oneself to a freewill offering outside of actually designating the animal.] And we have taught on Tannaite authority [M. Qin. 1:1G-M]: What is deemed [to be a pair of birds brought in fulfillment of] a vow? He who says, “Lo, I pledge myself to bring a burnt offering.” And what is deemed [to be a pair of birds brought] as a freewill offering? He who says, “Lo, this is a burnt offering.” What is the difference between vows and freewill offerings? In the case of vows, [if the birds] died or were stolen, he is answerable for them [and must replace them, as he said at V). In the case of freewill offerings, if they died or were stolen, he is not answerable for them [and need not replace them, in accordance with his words].*

W. *Said Rava, “You find a case [in which he has obligated himself to a freewill offering without having set the animal aside] in a situation in which he says, ‘Lo, I am obligated to a burnt-offering on the condition that I am not answerable for it [in a case in which it dies or is stolen].”*

X. *“With your mouth”—this refers to charity.*

Y. *Said Rava, “One becomes obligated immediately [to fulfill a vow to give] charity. What is the reason The poor are standing [waiting for help].”*

Z. *This is obvious [and goes without saying]!*

AA. *What might you have thought [that necessitated the explicit statement of this rule]? Since [the rule for charity] occurs in the context of [the discussion of] sacrifices, therefore, as in the case of sacrifices, [one has] until three festivals have passed [to fulfill one’s obligation to give charity]. So we are informed [to the contrary]: [Only] there [in the case of offerings] did the All-Merciful make them dependent upon the festivals. But here, [in the case of charity, he did] not [make it dependent upon the festivals], since the poor are numerous.*

- II.6** A. Said Rava, “As soon as any one festival has passed, [an individual who has not sacrificed an animal he consecrated] has transgressed a positive commandment.”
- B. *They objected [on the basis of M. Ed. 7:6]: Testified R. Joshua and R. Pappias concerning an offspring of peace offerings, that it is to be offered as peace offerings. [If the animal was pregnant while consecrated and gave birth before being sacrificed, the offspring shares its consecrated status.]*
- C. **Said R. Pappias, “I give testimony that we had a cow in the status of peace offerings, and we ate it on Passover and ate its offspring as peace offerings on the Festival [of Tabernacles].” [Pappias reports that the consecrated offspring was available for sacrifice on Passover but anyway was kept over that and the following festival, Pentecost. It finally was offered on Tabernacles. This suggests that, contrary to what Rava claims, A, there is no transgression in delaying sacrifice of a dedicated animal beyond a single festival.]**
- D. *Granted, on Passover they did not sacrifice it, for, I can argue, it was not yet old enough. [A new-born animal must remain with its mother for seven days and is acceptable as a sacrifice only from the eighth day on [Lev. 22:27]. If the offspring was born just before Passover, it could not have been offered on that festival.] But [as for this] offspring, [born before Passover], how could it have been kept over Pentecost, so as to involve a transgression of a positive commandment?*
- E. *Said R. Zebid, “It could have been a case [6b] in which it was sick on Pentecost [and therefore not acceptable for sacrifice].”*
- F. ***R. Ashi said, “What is the meaning of [Pappias’s statement], ‘And ate its offspring as peace offerings on the Festival’? It means the Festival of Pentecost.” [The offspring was too young for sacrifice on Passover, D, and it was not kept over Pentecost at all.]***
- G. *And the other [authority, that is, Zebid]?*
- H. *[He holds that] whenever [Pentecost] is referred to [in connection with] Passover, it is called Aseret.*
- I. And said Rava, “Once three festivals have passed, on each additional day [that he fails to offer the sacrifice] he [again] transgresses the restriction against delaying [fulfillment of his obligation].”
- J. ***They objected [on the basis of T. Ar. 3:18]: All the same are the firstling [and tithe] and all other Holy Things that one has sanctified. Once a year has passed, [even if it] did not encompass [three] festivals, or [three] festivals [have passed even if they] did not encompass a [full] year, he has transgressed the commandment against delaying.***
- K. *Now, as for this—in what way does it refute [Rava’s statement]?*
- L. *Said R. Kahana, “The one who raised the objection has done so well! Now, here [is the nature of the objection]: The Tannaite authority is going over negative commandments. [If he indeed agrees with Rava] let him teach [as does Rava]: on each additional day [that he fails to offer the sacrifice] he [again] transgresses the restriction against delaying [fulfillment of his obligation].” [Since the Tannaite rule does not indicate this explicitly, we assume that it disagrees with Rava’s statement of the law.]*



- M. *But [as for] the other, how does he view matters?*
- N. *[He holds that] the Tannaite authority is going over these things only to mark them as forbidden. He is not going over them to look for additional prohibitions!’ [Therefore, even though he might accept the rule as stated by Rava, he does not explicitly indicate so in this context.]*

- II.7 A.** *[We return to] the body [of T. Ar. 3:18]: All the same are the firstling [and tithe] and all other Holy Things that one has sanctified. Once a year has passed, [even if it] did not encompass [three] festivals, or [three] festivals [have passed even if they] did not encompass a [full] year, he has transgressed the commandment against delaying. Granted, it is possible for [three] festivals [to pass] without there having yet been a [full] year. But, a year’s passing without there being three festivals! How is this possible?*
- B. *Obviously this is possible in the view of one who holds [that a person violates the law against postponing the keeping of his vows only once the festivals of an entire year have passed] in their proper sequence. [In this view, a vow made prior to Pentecost, for instance, is subject to the prohibition against delay only after five festivals have passed: Pentecost, Tabernacles, and then all three festivals in their normal yearly sequence: Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. In this perspective, even after an initial year of days has passed, the three festivals that mark violation of the prohibition against delaying fulfillment of one’s vows have not yet gone by.] But as for one who does not hold [that a person violates the law against postponing the keeping of his vows only once the festivals of an entire year have passed] in their proper sequence—how is it possible [for a year of days to pass without three festivals’ having occurred]?*
- C. *Granted, in the view of Rabbi, this is possible in the case of an intercalated year. For it is taught on Tannaite authority: [In reference to a house purchased in a walled city, Lev. 25:30 says], “[If it is not redeemed within] a full year, [then the house that is in the walled city shall be made sure in perpetuity to him who bought it].” Rabbi says “One counts 356 days, that is, the number of days in the solar year.” And sages say, “One counts twelve months, from day to day [yielding a lunar year of 354 days]. And if the year is intercalated [so as to contain 383 days], it is intercalated to his [that is, the seller’s] advantage.” In the view of Rabbi, it is possible [for a year of days to pass without three festivals occurring], in a case in which he sanctified it after [the first day of] the festival of Passover, since, when the end of second Adar arrives, a full year [of 365 days] will have passed but [three] festivals will not have occurred. But in the view of Rabbis, how is it possible [for a year to pass without three festivals occurring]?*
- D. *It is as R. Shemaiah taught on Tannaite authority: Pentecost is sometimes on the fifth [day of the third month], sometimes on the sixth, and sometimes on the seventh. How is this so? If both of them [that is, the first two months, Nisan and Iyyar] are full, [containing 30 days, Pentecost, which always occurs on the fiftieth day from the second day of Passover,*

falls on the] fifth [day of Sivan, the third month]. If both of them [that is, Nisan and Iyyar] are defective, [containing only 29 days, Pentecost falls on the] seventh [day of Sivan]. If one of them is full and one is defective, [Pentecost falls on the] sixth [day of Sivan]. [In a year in which Pentecost falls on the fifth, the individual might sanctify an animal on the sixth. If in the following year Pentecost falls on the seventh, then, even in the view of sages at I, a full year of months will have passed and three festivals will not have occurred. We thus see that what is described at A is feasible within all interpretations of the prohibition against delaying.]

- E. *Now, which Tannaite authority disagrees with R. Shemaiah [and holds that Pentecost always falls on the same day, so that what is described at A is impossible]?*
- F. It is “Others.” *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Ar. 1:11]: Others say, “There is between one occurrence of Pentecost and another or between one New Year and another [an interval of] four [days of the week] or, if the year was intercalated, five [days].”* [“Others” hold that full and defective months occur in strict rotation. The year accordingly has 354 days, that is, 50 full weeks and four days, and Pentecost always falls on the sixth of Sivan. An intercalated month has 29 days, that is, four weeks and a day, yielding a five day difference in the day of the week on which the holiday falls.]

**II.8 A.** *R. Zera asked, “What is the law [whether or not] the prohibition against delaying applies to an heir?” [Do we hold that] the All-Merciful stated [Deu. 23:21], “When you make a vow [to the Lord your God, you shall not be slack to pay it]—and this one [that is, the heir] did not make the vow [and therefore is not subject to the prohibition against delaying]? Or, perhaps, [we should base our answer on Deu. 12: 5-6]: “[But you shall seek the place which the Lord your God will choose out of all your tribes to put his name and make his habitation there]; thither you shall go, and thither you shall bring your burnt offerings and your sacrifices...].” [Based upon this verse, since] this one is obligated [to go to the place the Lord chooses, he also is obligated to bring the offering without delay].*

- B. *Come and hear [which answer is correct]. For R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority, “[Deu. 23:21 states], ‘[For the Lord your God will surely require it] of you.’ This excludes the heir.”*
- C. *[The following suggests that the expression “of you” already has been interpreted as serving a different purpose. Accordingly, it cannot mean what Hiyya says.] But this [phrase], “of you,” is already needed. [Deu. 23:21 states: “of you.”] This refers to [T. Ar. 3:17] gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and that which is left growing in the corner of a field.*
- D. *[Hiyya can respond: One interpretation rests on Scripture’s] wording, “Imak” [which means, of you, and is all that is needed to make sense in the current context]. [The other interpretation rests on the fact that in Scripture, the full phrase is], “Me-imak” [literally, from of you].*

**II.9 A.** *R. Zera asked, “[As for] a women—what is the rule whether or not she is subject to the prohibition against delaying? Do we say [that she is not, since] she is not*

*obligated [in the first place] to appear [in Jerusalem on the festivals]? [See Deu. 16:16, which commands all the males to appear.] Or do we say [that she is subject to the prohibition, since] she is commanded to rejoice?” [Rejoicing implies partaking of the peace-offering, which must be done in Jerusalem. If she has to go to Jerusalem for that purpose, we might argue that she also must not delay payment of her vow.]*

- B. *Said to him R. Abbaye, “You should derive the answer from [the fact that] she is commanded to rejoice.”*
- C. *Now, did Abbaye really say this? For [to the contrary] thus did Abbaye say: “[As for] a woman—her husband makes her joyful.” [But the commandment that she rejoice has nothing to do with her going to Jerusalem.]*
- D. *Abbaye spoke within the terms established by Zera.*

- II.10** A. *They asked them, “[As for] a firstling—from when do they count the year [within which it must be sacrificed]?”*
- B. *Abbaye said, “From when it is born.”*
  - C. *R. Aha bar Jacob said, “From the point at which it can be used for appeasement [that is, the eighth day].”*
  - D. *And there is no conflict [between these two views]. This view [of Aha bar Jacob] applies in the case of an unblemished animal [which can be sacrificed no earlier than the eighth day]; [7a] [while] this view [of Abbaye] applies in the case of a blemished animal [which immediately may be eaten as ordinary meat].*
  - E. *Can one really consume a blemished animal [on the day it is born]? [Rashi: The animal might be premature and therefore forbidden for consumption; it may not be slaughtered and consumed until the eighth day; B. Shab. 135b.]*
  - F. *[Abbaye speaks of] a case in which he is certain that it completed its gestational period, [so that the animal is available for consumption on the day it is born].*

## **We now revert to the exposition of the law set forth in the Mishnah.**

- II.11** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: The first day of Nisan is the new year for months, leap years, and for [use of] the heave-offering of the *sheqel* [collected in the preceding month of Adar].*
- B. *And some say: also for the renting of houses. [In this view, the lease on a house rented for the current year always is up on the first of Nisan, even if the renter had possessed the house for less than a full year.]*
  - C. *“For months”—from what verse in Scripture do we know this?*
  - D. *As it is written [Exo. 12: 2-6]: “This month shall be for you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year for you. Tell all of the congregation of Israel that on the tenth day of this month they shall take every man a lamb according to their fathers’ houses, a lamb for a household; ... and you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month, when [the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel] shall kill [their lambs in the evening].”*
  - E. *And it is written [Deu. 16: 1]: “Observe the month of Abib [that is, “first-ripening grains”], [and keep the Passover to the Lord your God].”*
  - F. *Which is the month in which there are first-ripening grains?*

- G. You must say that this is Nisan [when Passover occurs], and [as Exo. 12: 2-6 states] it is called “first.”
- H. *But [to the contrary] I can argue that [the first day of] Iyyar [is the new year for months, A]!*
- I. *[For it to be the new year for months] we require [it to be a time of] first ripening grains, and [in Iyyar] there are none.*
- J. *But I can argue that [the first day of] Adar [in which grain begins to ripen is the new year for months, A]!*
- K. *[For it to be the new year for months] we require [it to be a time of] the majority of first ripening grains, and [in Adar] this does not [occur].*
- L. *Indeed, does Scripture [at Deu. 16: 1] state [that the first month yields] the majority of first ripening grains? [It does not and, accordingly, J’s claim stands.]*
- M. *[Arguing on different grounds:] Rather, said R. Hisda, “We know it from this [Scriptural passage: Lev. 23:39 states]: ‘On the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you have gathered in the produce of the land, [you shall keep the feast of the Lord seven days].’*
- N. *“In which month occurs the gathering [of the produce]?*
- O. *“You must say that this is Tishré.*
- P. *“And [Scripture] designates that [month] ‘seventh.’” [Hence we know that Tishré is not the new year for months, which is ‘first.’]*
- Q. *But [to the contrary] I can argue that Marheshvan [is the month of the gathering of the produce], and [in that case] what [does Lev. 23:39 mean by] ‘seventh’?*
- R. *It is seventh to Iyyar.*
- S. *According to Lev. 23:39, for a month to be called “seventh”] we require [it to be a time of] gathering, and [in Marheshvan] there is none.*
- T. *But I can argue that [reference] is to Elul, and [in that case] what [does Lev. 23:39 mean by] “seventh”?*
- U. *It is seventh to Adar.*
- V. *[For it to be called the seventh month] we require [it to be a time of] the majority of the gathering, and [in Elul] this does not occur.*
- W. *Indeed, does Scripture [at Lev. 23:39] state [that the seventh month yields] the majority of gathering? [It does not and, accordingly, V’s claim stands.]*
- X. *Rather, said Rabina, “We did not learn this matter [of the numbering of the months] from the Torah of Moses, our Rabbi. [Rather] we learned it from the words of tradition [that is, the prophetic writings or hagiographa].*
- Y. *“[For Zec. 1: 7 states:] ‘On the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month which is the month of Shevat....’”*
- Z. *Rabbah bar Ulla said, “[We learn the numbering] from here [Est. 2:16]: ‘And when Esther was taken to King Ahasuerus into his royal palace in the tenth month, which is the month of Tebeth....’”*
- AA. *Rav Kahana said, “[We learn the numbering] from here [Zec. 7: 1: ‘In the fourth year of King Darius, the word of the Lord came to Zechariah] on the fourth day of the ninth month, which is Chislev.’”*

- BB. Rav Aha bar Jacob said, “[We learn the numbering] from here [Est. 8: 9]: ‘The king’s secretaries were summoned at that time, in the third month, which is the month of Sivan.’”
- CC. Rav Ashi said, “[We learn the numbering] from here [Est. 3: 7]: ‘They cast Pur, that is the lot, before Haman day after day; and they cast it month after month till the twelfth month, which is the month of Adar.’”
- DD. *And if you wish, I can argue from here [Est. 3: 7]: “In the first month, which is the month of Nisan....”*
- EE. *Now, what is the reason that all [of the listed authorities] did not support [A’s claim, that Nisan is the first month] with this [direct statement of Est. 3: 7]?*
- FF. *Perhaps [in the setting of Est. 3: 7] what is the meaning of [the word] “first”? It was the first of [Haman’s] actions. [In this reading, Est. 3: 7 does not mean that Nisan is the first month at all.]*
- GG. *As regards the Tannaite authority behind our [pericope, M. R.H. 1:1B, who calls Nisan the New Year of kings and festivals, why did he not include the fact that Nisan is the new year for months]?*
- HH. *He was concerned with years, but not with months.*

**II.12 A.** [The first day of Nisan is the new year for months], leap years, [and for use of the heave-offering of the *sheqel*].

- B. *How do we know that [leap years are determined] from Nisan? For [to the contrary] is it not taught on Tannaite authority [T. San. 2:7]: They do not intercalate the year before the New Year [in Tishré], and if they did intercalate it, it is not deemed intercalated. But on account of necessity they do intercalate it immediately after the New Year. But even so, they intercalate only Adar [that is, only a second Adar may be added]. [The determination to intercalate the year by adding a second Adar can only be made after the start of Tishré. Accordingly it seems clear that Nisan, which comes after Adar but before Tishré, cannot be the new year for leap years.]*
- C. *[To solve this problem], said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “What is the meaning of ‘leap year’? It refers to the conclusion of [the period within which one may declare] a leap year, as it is taught on Tannaite authority [M. Ed. 7:7]: They [that is, Joshua and Pappias] gave testimony that the year may be intercalated [through the declaration that there will be a second Adar] at any time in Adar. For [authorities previously] had said, ‘The year may be intercalated] only up to Purim.’” [The first of Nisan marks the conclusion of the period during which a leap year may be declared. That declaration can be made only until the end of Adar.]*
- D. *What is the reasoning of the one who says that it may be intercalated only up to Purim?*
- E. *Insofar as a master said, “[People] inquire about the laws of Passover for thirty days prior to Passover,” [if, late in first Adar, after all the inquiries had been made, authorities determined that a second Adar were to be added, delaying Passover for a month], people might wind up neglecting [the rules of] leaven. [Rather than accept the new date, people would*

*observe Passover at the original time, within thirty days of receiving instruction regarding its rules.]*

- F. *But the other [side, which states that the year may be intercalated throughout Adar, holds that, since people] know that intercalation of the year depends upon a calculation, they reason that the Rabbis have not figured it out until now. [In this view, people will not become confused. They anticipate a late determination of whether or not there will be a second Adar.]*
- G. *As regards the Tannaite authority behind our [pericope, M. R.H. 1:1B, who calls Nisan the New Year of kings and festivals, why did he not include the fact that Nisan is the new year for leap years]?*
- H. *He was concerned with [the periods of which Nisan marks] the beginning but not [those of which Nisan marks] the end.*

**II.13 A.** [The first day of Nisan is the new year for months, leap years], and [for use of] the heave-offering of the *sheqel*. [Reference is to the *sheqel* contributed annually by every Israelite for maintenance of the sacrificial cult. Payment was made in Adar.]

- B. *How do we know this from Scripture?*
- C. Said R. Josiah, “[At Num. 28:14] Scripture said, ‘[Their drink offerings shall be half a hin of wine for a bull, a third of a hin for a ram, and a fourth of a hin for a lamb]; this is the burnt offering of each month throughout the months of the year.’ [Through a superfluous occurrence of the word ‘month’], the Torah indicates: Renew [the year] and bring an offering from the new heave-offering [of the *sheqel*]. And we learn that the ‘year’ [referred to here] is a year that starts with Nisan as it is written [Exo. 12: 2: ‘This month shall be for you the beginning of months]; it shall be the first month of the year for you.’”
- D. *But why not learn that the year [referred to here] is a year that starts with Tishré, as it is written [Deu. 11:12]: “[a land which the Lord your God cares for; the eyes of the Lord your God are always upon it], from the beginning of the year [to the end of the year].*
- E. We draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that includes [a mention of] “months” and a [different reference to] “year” that includes [a mention of] “months.” But we do not draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that includes [a mention of] “months” and a [different reference to] “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months.”

**II.14 A.** [Further as to communal sacrifices purchased by the *sheqel*-tax:] Said R. Judah said Samuel, “[As for] communal sacrifices brought on the first of Nisan—it is a commandment to bring [them, that is, to purchase them] from new [contributions to the *sheqel*-chamber].

- B. “But if one brought them from old [contributions], he has fulfilled his obligation [and the sacrifice is valid], except that he has failed [to fulfill] a commandment.”
- C. *A Tannaite statement makes the same point:* [As for] communal sacrifices brought on the first of Nisan—it is a commandment to bring [them; that is, to purchase them] from new [contributions].



- D. But if one brought them from old [contributions], he has fulfilled his obligation, except that he has failed [to fulfill] a commandment.
- E. And as for a private individual who contributed [sacrifices] from his own [property]—they are valid, so long as he gave them over to the community.
- F. *That is obvious [and goes without saying]!*
- G. *But what might one have thought? [One might have reasoned that we should] be concerned that [the individual] had not [7b] intended wholeheartedly to transfer them to the community [so that, contrary to what E tells us, the sacrifices are not valid]. So we are informed, [that we need not be concerned whether or not the individual really meant to give the sacrifices over to the community].*
- J. *As regards the Tannaite authority behind our [pericope, M. R.H. 1:1B, who calls Nisan the New Year of kings and festivals, why did he not include the fact that Nisan is the new year for the heave-offering of the sheqel]?*
- K. *Since it is taught on Tannaite authority that if one [anyway] brought [the offering from old [contributions], he has fulfilled his obligation, [the authority behind M. R.H. 1:1] was uncertain [whether or not the first of Nisan should be considered new year for this purpose].*

**II.15 A.** [The first day of Nisan is the new year for months, leap years, and for use of the heave-offering of the *sheqel*.] And some say: also for the renting of houses.

- B. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. One who rents a house to his fellow for a year counts twelve months from the [exact] day [of the rental] to the [same] day [in the month, twelve months later].
- D. But if he said [that the rental is], “For this year,” then even if [the tenant] only took possession on the first of Adar, as soon as the first of Nisan arrived [thirty days later], his year [of rental] is deemed completed.
- E. *And even in [the view of] one who says, “a single day in the year can be considered a full year” [this rule, which suggests that the minimum period of rental is thirty days, creates no problem, since] this situation is unique, insofar as a person does not go to the trouble of renting a house for less than thirty days.*
- F. *Now, can I not argue that Tishré [is the new year for the renting of houses]? [If this is the case, a person who moves in on the first of Elul could be told that his tenancy is up on the first of Tishré, thirty days later.]*
- G. *It is taken for granted that, when a man rents a house [in Tishré], he rents it for the entire rainy season.*
- H. *As regards the first authority in the Tannaite statement and the Tannaite authority behind our [pericope, M. R.H. 1:1B—why did they not state that Nisan is the new year for the renting of houses]?*
- I. *In Nisan too rainy weather occurs, [so that, even then, a person who rents a house for the year cannot intend only thirty days].*

**III.1 A.** The first day of Elul is the new year for tithing cattle [M. R.H. 1:1C].

- B. *Which [Tannaitic authority stands behind this statement]?*

- C. It is R. Meir, *as we have taught on Tannaite authority* [M. Bekh. 9:5]: R. Meir says, “On the first of Elul is the new year for tithing cattle.”
- D. [The first day of Nisan is the new year for kings] and festivals [M. R.H. 1:1B]. Which [Tannaitic authority stands behind this statement regarding festivals]?
- E. It is R. Simeon. [This is based upon T. R.H. 1:2, where Simeon clearly understands there to be a new year for festivals.]
- F. Cite the following clause [at M. R.H. 1:1D]: R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “[The new year for tithing cattle] is on the first day of Tishré.” [Is it possible that] the first clause [at M. R.H. 1:1B] and the final clause [at M. R.H. 1:1D] are [the opinion of] R. Simeon, while the middle clause [at M. R.H. 1:1C] is [the opinion of] R. Meir?
- G. [To resolve this problem] said R. Joseph, “[The authority behind the construction at M. R.H. 1:1B-D] is Rabbi [Judah the Patriarch], and he chose [the individual statements of law] according to the views of different Tannaite authorities. In determining [the new year for] festivals, he accepted the reasoning of R. Simeon, while, in determining [the new year for] tithing cattle, he accepted the reasoning of R. Meir.”
- H. If this is the case, [why does he state at M. R.H. 1:1A that there are] four [new years]? There are five! [These are: the first of Nisan (kings); the fifteenth of Nisan (festivals); the first of Elul (tithing cattle); the first of Tishré (years, Sabbaticals, Jubilees), the first/fifteenth of Shevat (trees).]
- I. [To solve the problem raised by L-M] said Rava, “Both parties, [Simeon and Meir,] agree on four: In the view of R. Meir there are four, excluding the [new year of] festivals, [which Simeon places on the fifteenth of Nisan]. In the view of R. Simeon there are four, excluding the [new year of] tithing cattle.” [Meir places the new year of tithing cattle on the first of Elul, as an independent new year. Simeon, M. R.H. 1:1D dates this to the first of Tishré, so that it is not an independent new year to be counted separately.]
- J. [Solving L-M’s problem in a different manner], R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “[M. R.H. 1:1A means that] there are four months in which there are a number of new years.” [In Nahman’s view, the superscription at M. R.H. 1:1A counts as one the two new year days that occur in Nisan.]
- K. They objected [to Rava and Nahman’s responses based upon the following tradition]: The sixteen of Nisan is the new year for the omer, [after which date new grain may be eaten; see Lev. 23:14]; the sixth of Sivan is the new year for two loaves [that make up the meal offering of the new grain; see Lev. 23:17].
- L. [In light of this rule], in the view of Rava, [M. R.H. 1:1] should teach [that there are] six [new years]. [This would include the four to which Meir and Simeon concur at M. R.H. 1:1 and the additional two new years indicated by the law cited at R.] [Similarly, in light of this rule], in the view of Nahman bar Isaac, [M. R.H. 1:1] should teach [that there are] five [new years]. [This would include the four separate months listed at M. R.H. 1:1 in which there are new years plus Sivan, indicated at R as containing a new year.]

- M. *[Explaining why R-T's objection is not probative] said R. Pappa, "[In establishing the number of new years, the authority behind M. R.H. 1:1 only] counted those that commence on the [preceding] evening; those that do not commence on the [preceding] evening, he did not count." [This excludes from consideration the two new years listed at R. The new year for the omer does not commence until the point during the day at which the omer actually is offered. The same consideration applies for the case of the two loaves.]*
- N. *But indeed, [as for the new year for] festivals—even though [with respect to delaying the payment of vows] it does not commence on the [preceding] evening, it is counted! [The rule against delaying is transgressed only after the hour at which the animal vowed actually could have been sacrificed.]*
- O. *Since he has to bring [his offering to the Temple before the start of the festival and has not done so], from the beginning [of the festival, at sundown on the preceding night] he is guilty [of having transgressed]. [This is the case even though the offering, had he brought it, would not be sacrificed until the following morning.]*
- P. *But indeed, in the case of [the new year for] Jubilee years—even though it does not start on the [preceding] evening, it is counted [at M. R.H. 1:1]! [The start of the Jubilee year is marked by the blowing of the shofar during the daytime on the Day of Atonement.]*
- Q. *[The Talmud now explains that the Jubilee year does begin on the preceding evening. Pappa's perspective thus stands.] This is the view of R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Berokah, who said [see below, B. R.H. 8b], "The Jubilee year begins on the new year." [In the view of Ishmael, the Jubilee year starts on the evening of the new year and does not depend upon the blowing of the shofar at all. Pappa's explanation of M. R.H. 1:1's statement that there are (only) four new years therefore stands.]*
- R. *Rab Shesha the son of Rab Idi said, "[In establishing the number of new years, the authority behind M. R.H. 1:1A only] counted those that do not require some action [on the part of an individual]; those that do require some action [on the part of an individual], he did not count."*
- S. *But indeed, [the new year] for festivals is among those that require an action [on the part of the individual], but [even so] it is counted. [The rule against delaying is transgressed only after the hour at which the animal vowed actually could have been sacrificed. Hence, we can understand this new year to depend upon the sacrificing of the morning offering.]*
- T. *[But transgression of the commandment that one] not delay [fulfillment of vows] occurs automatically [on the evening of the new year of festivals, without any activity on the part of an individual].*
- U. **[8a]** *But what of [the new year for] Jubilees [which, it was argued at X, begins only when the shofar is blown on the day of atonement].*
- V. *This [explanation of M. R.H. 1:1A] follows the view of R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Berokah. [In Ishmael's view, the Jubilee year starts on the evening of the new year and does not depend upon the blowing of the shofar on the following day.]*

- W. [A different reason that M. **R.H. 1:1A** includes only four new years is given.] But Rav Ashi said, “[M. **R.H. 1:1A** means that [there are four new years that occur on the first [days] of four months. [The new year for the *omer* and for the two loaves, which fall in the middle of the month (R), are not included.]
- X. [Ashi’s view is unacceptable, since, in his approach, to reach four new year days, we must include] the first day of Shevat, which accords with the view of the House of Shammai. [In Ashi’s count, the four new year days at M. **R.H. 1:1A** appear to be: 1) the first of Nisan (kings and festivals); 2) the first of Elul (tithing cattle); 3) the first of Tishré (years, Sabbatical years, and Jubilees); 4) the first of Shevat (trees). The problem is that this fourth new year accords only with the House of Shammai. The Hillelites, whose view represents the decided law, hold that the new year for trees is on the fifteenth of Shevat. Insofar as it suggests that the law follows the Shammaites, Ashi’s approach is unacceptable.]
- Y. [Ashi’s approach is explained in a way that shows it not to violate the principle that the law follows the Shammaites.] [Ashi] interprets [M. R.H. 1:1A] to mean [that] according to all parties, there are three new year days [that fall on the first of the month]. [But, whether or not] the first of Shevat [is a fourth new year day to be added to this list] is disputed by the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel.

**IV.1 A. [The first day of Elul is the new year for tithing cattle.] R. Eleazar and R. Simeon say, “It is on the first day of Tishré” [M. **R.H. 1:1C-D**].**

- B. Said R. Yohanan, “Both authorities [in this dispute reached their views by] interpreting the same verse [of Scripture]. For it is stated [Psa. 65:13], ‘The rams have mounted the sheep, the valleys deck themselves with grain, they shout and sing.’ R. Meir [the authority behind M. **R.H. 1:1C**] reasoned, ‘When do the rams mount the sheep? It is at the time that the valleys deck themselves with grain. And when are the valleys decked with grain? During Adar. They conceive in Adar and give birth in Ab. [Accordingly] their new year is in Elul.’
- C. [By contrast] R. Eleazar and R. Simeon [who hold that the new year for tithing cattle is in Tishré] say, “When do the rams mount the sheep? It is when they [that is, the stalks of grain] shout and sing. When do the stalks of grain sing? During Nisan. They conceive in Nisan and give birth in Elul. [Accordingly] their new year is in Tishré.”
- D. [As matters have been reported, only the view of Eleazar and Simeon, E, takes into account the end of the verse: “they shout and sing.”] *But for the other [authority, Meir] this statement also appears: ‘...they sing....’ [How does Meir make sense of this statement?]*
- E. *[He holds that] this refers to the ones that conceive late in the season, which occurs in Nisan.*
- F. *[As matters have been reported, only the view of Meir, takes into account the middle of the verse: “the valleys deck themselves with grain.”] But for the other [authorities, Eleazar and Simeon] this statement also appears: “the valleys deck themselves with grain.”*

- G. *[They hold that] this refers to the ones that conceive early in the season, which occurs in Adar.*
- H. Granted that R. Meir's position [makes sense]: It is written, "The rams have mounted the sheep." [This refers to] the time at which "the valleys deck themselves with grain." But there are also those [that conceive later, at the time at which] "they shout and sing." *But for the view of R. Eleazar and R. Simeon [to be derived from Psa. 65:13], the clauses would have to be reversed:* "The rams have mounted the sheep." [This refers to] the time at which "they shout and sing." But there are also those [that conceive earlier, at the time at which] "the valleys deck themselves with grain."
- I. [In the following, Rava offers a different way to derive Simeon/Eleazar and Meir's contrasting views from the same verse.] *Rather, said Rava, "All agree [on the interpretation of] 'the rams have mounted the sheep' [as referring to] the time at which 'the valleys deck themselves with grain.' This occurs in Adar. Instead, they differ concerning [the interpretation of] this verse [Deu. 14:22]: 'Tithing, you shall tithe.' Scripture speaks of two kinds of tithe: one is a tithe of cattle, and the other is a tithe of grain. R. Meir reasons that [Scripture thus] treats as analogous the tithe of cattle and the tithe of grain: just as, in the case of the tithe of grain, the tithe must be separated close to the time that the grain becomes liable [which occurs in Elul], so in the case of the tithe of cattle, the tithe must be separated close to the time that the cattle become liable [in Adar]. But R. Eleazar and R. Simeon reason that [Scripture] treats as analogous the tithe of cattle and the tithe of grain [in a different way]: just as, in the case of the tithe of grain, its new year occurs in Tishré, so in the case of the tithe of cattle, its new year is in Tishré."*

**V.1 A. The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years; [M. R.H. 1:1E]:**

- B. *What is the purpose of this rule?*
- C. Said R. Pappa, "It is because of legal documents, *as we have taught on Tannaite authority* [M. **Sheb. 10:5B**]: **Antedated bonds are invalid, but postdated bonds are valid.**" [Documents are dated according to day and month in the year of the reign of a specific king. Counting all years from the first of Tishré makes it easy to determine when a legal document was created, even for people who do not know the day on which a specific king assumed the throne.]
- D. *But [suggesting that the reason cannot be as Pappa states] thus we have taught on Tannaite authority* [M. **R.H. 1:1B**]: **the first day of Nisan is the new year for kings.** *And we stated : What is the purpose of this rule?* Said Rav Hisda, 'It is because of legal documents.' [Accordingly, the new year for legal documents is Nisan, not Tishré. Pappa appears to be incorrect.]
- E. *There is no contradiction: This [statement, M. **R.H. 1:1B** refers to Israelite kings, [whose reign is dated to Nisan], while this statement [M. **R.H. 1:1E**] refers to kings of other nations, [whose new year is in Tishré].*
- F. *What, then, of that which Rav Hisda said: "They taught [that Nisan is the new year for kings] only for the case of Israelite kings. But in the case of kings of other*



*nations, we count [the years of their reign] from Tishré’”? Did Rav Hisda intend only to tell us what the Mishnah [itself] makes explicit?*

- G. *No! Rav Hisda intended to teach us the significance of [verses of] Scripture.*
- H. *And if you wish, I can argue that Rav Hisda explained this passage in the Mishnah, [M. R.H. 1:1E, which holds that the first of Tishré is the new year for years] in accord with [the view of] R. Zera. For R. Zera said, “[M. R.H. 1:1E’s statement, that the first of Tishré is the new year for years, means that it is the new year for determining] annual cycles.” [Simon, p. 30: This view holds that the year is comprised of four cycles, that of the vernal equinox, beginning in Nisan; that of the summer solstice, beginning in Tamuz; that of the autumn equinox, beginning in Tishré; and that of the winter solstice, beginning in Tevet.]*
- I. *And this follows the view of R. Eliezer, who said, “In Tishré, the world was created.”*

**V.2 A.** R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “[M. **R.H. 1:1E** refers] to [the final] judgment, as it is written [Deu. 11:12, ‘The eyes of the Lord your God are always upon it], from the beginning of the year to the end of the year,’ [which means]: ‘From the beginning of the year’ what will occur at the end is determined.

- B. *“From what [passage in Scripture do we know that this takes place] in Tishré? For it is written [Psa. 81: 3], ‘Blow the trumpet at the new moon, when the moon is covered [Heb. root: KSH], on our feast day.’ On which festival [8b] is the moon covered [Heb. root: KSH]? We must say it is New Year’s Day [in Tishré, which falls on the new moon, unlike all other festivals, which come in the middle of the month]. And [in the following verse, Psa. 8:14] it is written [regarding this festival], ‘For it is a statute *hoq* for Israel, an ordinance of the God of Jacob.”*

**V.3 A.** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* [The verse], “For it is a statute for Israel, an ordinance [or: (time of) judgment] of the God of Jacob” teaches that the heavenly court does not assemble [to sit] in judgment unless the earthly court has sanctified the new month. [Rashi: Only if the Israelite court has enacted the “statute” designating the new month does the heavenly court engage in the work of judgment.]

- B. *A different Tannaite teaching states:* [Psa. 8:14 indicates]: “For it is a statute for Israel.” [Based upon this verse] I know only that [the people of] Israel [will be judged]. From what Scriptural verse [do I know that] the [other] nations of the world [also will be judged]? Scripture states, “an ordinance of the God of Jacob.” [Since this is an ordinance of the God of Jacob, it applies all peoples.] If this is the case [that all peoples will be judged], why does Scripture need to state, “For it is a statute for Israel”? [If the other nations are to be judged, it goes without saying that the Israelites also will be. The statement “For it is a statute for Israel” accordingly must teach us some additional, otherwise unknown fact.] It teaches that [the people of] Israel will go forth first to be judged.

C. *This accords with Rav Hisda [see below, 16a], for said R. Hisda, “[When] the king and the community [await judgment], the king enters in first for judgment, as it is said [1Ki. 8:59: ‘May He maintain] the case of his servant [Solomon] and [then] the case of his people [Israel].’”*

D. *What is the reason [that the king is judged first]?*



- E. *If you wish I can argue that it is not proper for the king to remain outside [alone while the people are being judged].*
- F. *And if you wish I can argue that [the king is judged] before [God has heard the community's sins and] really become angry.*

**VI.1. A. [The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years,] for Sabbatical years; [M. R.H. 1:1E]:**

- B. *From what verse of Scripture do we know this?*
- C. As it is written [Lev. 25: 4]: “But in the seventh year there shall be a Sabbath of solemn rest for the land, [a Sabbath to the Lord; you shall not sow your field or prune your vineyard].”
- D. *Now, one must conclude [that the meaning of the word] “year” is “a year [beginning] from Tishré,” since it is written [Deu. 11:12]: “from the beginning of the year [to the end of the year].”*
- E. *Now, [following this same approach] one should conclude [that the meaning of the word] “year” is “a year [beginning] from Nisan,” since it is written [Exo. 12: 2: “This month shall be for you the beginning of months;] it shall be the first month of the year for you.”*
- F. We draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months” and a [different reference to] “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months.” But we do not draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months” and a [different reference to] “year” that does include [a mention of] “months.”

**VII.1 A. [The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years, for Sabbatical years, and for Jubilees; [M. R.H. 1:1E].**

- B. [Is the new year for] Jubilees [indeed] on the first of Tishré? [Rather the new year for] Jubilees is on the tenth of Tishré!
- C. [This is] as it is written [Lev. 25: 9, referring to the Jubilee year: “Then you shall send abroad the loud trumpet, on the tenth day of the seventh month]; on the Day of Atonement you shall send abroad the trumpet [throughout all your land].”
- D. *Who, then, [stands behind M. R.H. 1:1E, which holds that the new year for the Jubilee is the first of Tishré]?*
- E. *[It is] R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, as it is taught on Tannaite authority: [It is written, Lev. 25:10]: “And you shall hallow the fiftieth year.” What is the meaning of this [passage in] Scripture? Since [at Lev. 25: 9] it says, “On the Day of Atonement,” it is possible [for one to think] that [the Jubilee year] is sanctified only from the Day of Atonement and onward. [Therefore] Scripture states [at Lev. 25:10]: “And you shall hallow the fiftieth year.” This teaches that [the Jubilee] is sanctified from its [that is, the year’s] inception, [on the first of Tishré].*
- F. Based on this [reasoning], said R. Ishmael the son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, “From New Year [on the first of Tishré of the Jubilee year] through the Day of Atonement [on the tenth of Tishré] slaves are neither set free to return to their homes nor forced to serve their masters. Rather, they eat, drink, and rejoice with wreaths on their heads. Once the Day of Atonement arrived, the court sounded

the trumpet, the slaves are set free to return to their homes, and the fields are returned to their [original] owners.”

G. *But [as for] the rabbis [who say that the Jubilee starts only on the tenth of Tishré—how do they interpret Lev. 25:10]?*

H. [They say it means that] one sanctifies years but not months.

**VII.2** A. *A different Tannaite teaching states: [Lev. 25:11 indicates]: “A Jubilee [shall the fiftieth year be to you].”*

B. What is the point of this verse?

C. Since [Lev. 25:10 states], “And you shall hallow the fiftieth year,” one could think that, just as [the Jubilee] is sanctified from its [that is, the year’s] inception [on the first of Tishré], so it continues to be sanctified after its [that is, the year’s] conclusion.

D. And there would be no reason to be surprised [that Scripture should hold this to be the case], for [commonly] one lengthens sanctified time by [continuing it into] secular time.

E. [In order to preclude the wrong conclusion drawn at C+D], Scripture [explicitly] states [Lev. 25:11], “A Jubilee shall the fiftieth year be to you.”

F. [This means that] you may sanctify the fiftieth year [as the Jubilee], but you may not sanctify the fifty-first year.

G. **[9a]** *But [as for] the Rabbis [who hold that the Jubilee does not start right at the beginning of Tishré—how do they interpret Lev. 25:11’s statement: “A jubilee shall the fiftieth year be to you”]?*

H. [They reason]: You are to count the fiftieth year, but you are not to count the fifty-first year. [The fiftieth year is not to be counted as the first year of the following septennate.]

I. *[And this interpretation serves] to counter [the view] of R. Judah, who said, “The fiftieth year is counted both here [as the final year of the current fifty year cycle] and here [as the first year of the coming septennate]. So we are informed that this is not so.*

**VII.3** A. *And [regarding the claim that commonly] one lengthens sanctified time by [continuing it into] secular time—from what verse in Scripture do we know this?*

B. *As it is taught on Tannaite authority [see M. Sheb. 1:4: Exo. 34:21 states: “For six days you shall work, but on the seventh day you shall cease work; even] at plowing time and harvesting time you shall cease work.”*

C. R. Aqiba says, “There is no need [for Scripture] to mention plowing and harvesting of the Sabbatical year, since, [in order expressly to prohibit this, Lev. 25: 4-5] already has stated: “[But in the seventh year there shall be a Sabbath of solemn rest for the land, a Sabbath to the Lord]; you shall not sow your field [or prune your vineyard]”

D. “Rather [Scripture refers to] plowing on the eve of the Sabbatical year, [the benefits of which] extend into the Sabbatical year and harvesting [the crop of] the Sabbatical year which extends into the year following the Sabbatical.”

E. [The following continues B-C’s citation of M. Sheb. 1:4. Since Ishmael disagrees with B-C’s interpretation of Exo. 34:21, we will then need to

ascertain his understanding of the source in Scripture of the rule that one may lengthen a period of sanctified time.] **R. Ishmael says, “[Rather Exo. 34:21 teaches that] just as plowing, [which] is a voluntary act, [is prohibited on the Sabbath] so [only] harvesting [which likewise] is voluntary [is prohibited on the Sabbath]. This excludes [from the prohibition] harvesting the first sheaf which is a commandment [and, accordingly, is permitted even on the Sabbath].”**

- F. *Now [in the view of] R. Ishmael: [as for the notion that] one lengthens sanctified time by [continuing it into] secular time—from what verse in Scripture do we know this?*
- G. *He derives it from that which is taught on Tannaite authority: [Lev. 23:32 states]: “And you shall afflict yourselves; on the ninth [day of the month beginning at evening].” [Based on this verse] one might think [the point is literally that] the ninth [of the month is the day of affliction]. Scripture [therefore] states: “Beginning at evening.” If it is “at evening,” one might think [that the day of affliction begins] after dark. [To preclude that wrong conclusion] Scripture states, “On the ninth day...” [After dark it is already the tenth of the month.] How do I understand this? One begins to afflict oneself while it is still day [on the ninth]. [The fact that the day of affliction continues on to the tenth] teaches that one lengthens sanctified time by [continuing it into] secular time.*
- H. *[Based upon what we have seen so far] I know only [that this rule applies] at the inception [of the holy day]. From what verse in Scripture do I learn the rule for the conclusion of the holy day?*
- I. *Scripture states [Lev. 23:32: “It shall be to you a Sabbath of solemn rest, and you shall afflict yourselves; on the ninth day of the month beginning at evening], from evening to evening [you shall rest on your sabbath].” [Hence I know that even though the holy day is designated as being on the ninth of the month it continues through the tenth.]*
- J. *[Based upon what we have seen so far] I know only [that this rule applies] to the Day of Atonement. From what verse in Scripture do I learn the rule for Sabbaths?*
- K. *Scripture states [Lev. 23:32: “It shall be to you a Sabbath of solemn rest, and you shall afflict yourselves; on the ninth day of the month beginning at evening, from evening to evening] you shall rest [on your sabbath].” [Reference to the word “Sabbath” indicates that that holy day is subject to the same rule as the Day of Atonement.]*
- L. *From what verse in Scripture do I learn the rule for festivals?*
- M. *Scripture [Lev. 23:32] states, “[You shall rest on] your Sabbath.”*
- N. *How do I interpret this?*
- O. *On any occasion to which the precept of rest applies, one lengthens sanctified time by [continuing it into] secular time.*
- P. *But [as for] R. Aqiba: how does he interpret [Lev. 23:32’s statement]: “And you shall afflict yourselves; on the ninth [day of the month beginning at evening]”? [Unlike Ishmael in the preceding unit, Aqiba does not*

require that verse to prove that one extends sanctified time into secular time. It therefore must mean something different to him.]

- Q. *He needs it for that which Hiyya bar Rab of Difti taught on Tannaite authority.* For Hiyya bar Rab of Difti taught on Tannaite authority: [Lev. 23:32 states], “And you shall afflict yourselves; on the ninth day of the month beginning at evening.” Now, do people fast on the ninth of the month? Do they not fast on the tenth of the month? Accordingly [it must be the case that] the passage serves to tell you [something entirely different, namely]: Someone who eats and drinks on the ninth of the month is [still] regarded by Scripture [9b] as if he had fasted on the ninth and the tenth.”

- VII.4** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* [Lev. 25:10 states], “It is a Jubilee.” [This means that it is a Jubilee] even though they did not observe the release [of fields] and even though they did not sound the horn.
- B. Might I think [that it is deemed a Jubilee] even though they did not dismiss [the slaves]?
- C. [To indicate the contrary] Scripture [at Lev. 25:10] states: “It is [a Jubilee].”
- D. [The preceding follows] the view of R. Judah.
- E. R. Yosé says, “[Lev. 25:10 states], ‘It is a Jubilee.’ [This means that it is a Jubilee] even though they did not observe the release [of fields] and even though they did not dismiss [the slaves].
- F. “Might I think [that it is deemed a Jubilee] even though they did not sound the horn?
- G. “[To prevent this wrong reasoning] Scripture [at Lev. 25:10] states: ‘It is [a Jubilee].’”
- H. [Yosé continues, explaining his position. If the term “Jubilee” is inclusive, E, but the words “it is” are limiting, G, there is no obvious reason for him to require the sounding of the trumpet but not to require the dismissal of slaves.] “And if, insofar as one Scriptural statement is inclusive and one is limiting, [you ask], ‘Why do I reason that it is a Jubilee even though they do not dismiss the slaves, but it is not a Jubilee unless they sound the trumpet’—[I can answer as follows]:
- I. “It is possible for there to be no [opportunity] for dismissal of slaves [e.g., if no Israelite slaves exist], but it is not possible for there to be no [opportunity] to sound the trumpet, [since trumpets will always exist]. [Accordingly, it makes sense to require blowing the trumpet. But, if were we to require dismissal of slaves, a situation could arise in which the Jubilee would not take place.]
- J. “Another reason: This [sounding of the trumpet] is in the authority of a court, while this [dismissal of slaves] is not in the authority of a court.” [Rashi: A court can require its agent to sound the trumpet. By contrast, since slaves are held by individuals, the court might not be able to compel their dismissal. Since dismissal of slaves cannot be guaranteed, it was not made a condition of the Jubilee year.]
- K. *What need is there for the additional reason, J.?*
- L. *If you argue that it is impossible that there will not somewhere be one [slave] who can be dismissed, [such that, contrary to I, both sounding the trumpet and dismissal of slaves should be required], [I can respond that] this [sounding of the*

trumpet] is in the authority of a court, while this [dismissal of slaves] is not in the authority of a court.

- M. *Granted, the position of R. Yosé makes sense, for it has been explained,. But, as for R. Judah, [A-C], what is his reasoning [in requiring the dismissal of slaves but not requiring the sounding of the trumpet]?*
- N. [In the clause preceding the one under discussion] Scripture states [Lev. 25:10]: “And you shall proclaim liberty throughout the land [to all its inhabitants].” [The verse continues: “It is a Jubilee for you.”] *And [Judah] holds that a verse may be interpreted on the basis of what precedes it but not on the basis of what precedes that.*
- O. *All authorities concur that [the word] “deror” refers to freedom. What so indicates?*
- P. *As it is taught on Tannaite authority: [The word] “deror” refers to freedom*
- Q. Said R. Judah, “To what does [the word] “deror” refer? [To the freedom of] one who dwells in a dwelling place [of his own choosing] and can bring goods throughout the whole country.”
- R. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “These are the views of R. Judah and R. Yosé. But sages say, ‘[Neglect of any of] the three [matters—dismissal of slaves, release of fields, and sounding of the trumpet—] invalidates [the Jubilee].”
- S. *[Sages have this view] because they hold that a verse is interpreted on the basis of what precedes it, on the basis of what precedes that, as well as on the basis of what follows it.*
- T. But [following the limiting words “it is”], we find written in Scripture [the inclusive language], “Jubilee”! [One would think that the inclusive term should neutralize the limiting force of “it is” so that, contrary to sages view, we do not require all three aspects of the Jubilee.]
- U. *[Rather, the inclusive language intends to indicate that the Jubilee exists] even outside of the land of Israel].*
- V. [But Lev. 25:10 explicitly states: “And you shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty] throughout the land.” [This seems to indicate that the Jubilee applies only within the land of Israel.]
- W. [The reference to “in the land” indicates that] when liberty occurs in the land [of Israel] it also will occur outside of the land. When liberty does not occur in the land [of Israel] it also will not occur outside of the land.

**VIII.1 A. [The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years, for Sabbatical years, and for Jubilees], for planting [trees and for vegetables; M. R.H. 1:1E-F].**

- B. From what verse in Scripture do we know this rule [regarding planting]?
- C. As it is written in Scripture [Lev. 19:23: “When you come into the land and plant all kinds of trees for food, then you shall count their fruit as forbidden]; three years it shall be forbidden to you, [it must not be eaten].”
- D. And it is written [Lev. 19:24]: “And in the fourth year [all their fruit shall be holy, an offering of praise to the Lord].”

- E. Now, one must conclude [that the meaning of the word] “year” is “a year [beginning] from Tishré,” since it is written [Deu. 11:12]: “from the beginning of the year [to the end of the year].”
- F. Now, [following this same approach] one should conclude [that the meaning of the word] “year” is “a year [beginning] from Nisan,” since it is written [Exo. 12: 2: “This month shall be for you the beginning of months;] it shall be the first month of the year for you.”
- G. We draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months” and a [different reference to] “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months.” But [unlike what is proposed at F], we do not draw an analogy between [a reference to] a “year” that does not include [a mention of] “months” [as at Lev. 19:24] and a [different reference to] “year” that does include [a mention of] “months,” [as at Exo. 12: 2].

**VIII.2 A.** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. R.H. 1:8 (= T. Sheb. 2: 3), referring to M. R.H. 1:1E-F’s rule that the first of Tishré is the new year for planting trees]: The same rule applies to one who plants a tree, plants a shoot, or grafts a branch onto a tree on the eve of the Sabbatical year, thirty days before the New Year: [on the first of Tishré that which was planted] is credited with a [full] year [of growth], so that it is permitted to let it continue growing during the Sabbatical year.*

- B. [If it was planted] fewer than thirty days before the New Year, [on the first of Tishré] it is not credited with a [full] year [of growth], so that it is forbidden to let it continue growing during the Sabbatical year.
- C. **[10a]** [Even though the age of the tree is counted from the first of Tishré], the produce of such a sapling is forbidden until the fifteenth of Shevat [of the year in which the tree’s produce becomes permitted for common use].
- D. When [the tree is] *orlah* [that is, in its first three years of growth] it [remains in the status of] *orlah* [until the fifteenth of Shevat, even though the tree will have completed its third year on the preceding first of Tishré].
- E. And when [the tree is] in its fourth year [of growth] it [remains subject to the prohibitions of] the fourth year [until the fifteenth of Shevat].
- F. *What is the source of these rules?*
- G. *Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, and some attribute it in the name of R. Yannai, “Scripture [Lev. 19:24-25] said, ‘And in the fourth year [all their fruit shall be holy, an offering of praise to the Lord]. But in the fifth year [you may eat of their fruit, that they may yield more richly for you].’ [The verse suggests that] there are times that [produce grows] in [the tree’s] fourth year yet still is forbidden under the restrictions of orlah, [which normally apply only for three years]. And there are times that [produce grows] in [the tree’s] fifth year yet still is forbidden under the restrictions of the fourth year.”*
- J. *Should we reason that A. does not accord with [the view of] R. Meir? For if it were R. Meir, he has said, “A single day in the year can be considered a full year.” [This contrasts with A, which requires thirty days.]*
- K. [Proving that Meir holds the position attributed to him at K:] *For it is taught on Tannaite authority: “The bullock referred to in the Torah*



without specification is twenty-four months and one day old”—the words of R. Meir.

- L. R. Eleazar says, “[It is] twenty-four months and thirty days old.”
- M. For R. Meir used to say, “Wherever in the Torah it says ‘calf’ without further specification [it is] one year old; ‘young ox’ [means] two years old; ‘bullock’ [means] three years old.” [Meir thus equates twenty-four months and one day with three full years; he holds that a single day can be considered a year.]
- N. *You can even argue [that] R. Meir [agrees with the rule at A]. When R. Meir stated that a single day in the year can be considered a full year, [he meant that this applies] at the conclusion of the year; but at the beginning of the year this is not the case. [A single day completes the three-year age requirement of the bullock. But a single day does not comprise a year for beginning the count of the age of a tree. In that, Meir concurs with A, requiring thirty days.]*
- O. Said Rava, “Is [the fact that it makes no difference whether the single day is at the beginning or end of the period] not an argument *a fortiori*? Now, if, in the case of a menstruant, in whose case the beginning of the [seventh] day is *not* counted as concluding [her period of purification, which ends only at nightfall on that day, even so] the end of the [first] day *is* counted as the beginning [of her period of purification, so that she begins counting in the middle of the day, and, at nightfall, is deemed to have completed a full day], [then, in the case of a period of] a year, in which a single day is counted [as a whole year] at the end, **[10b]** is it not logical that a single day should [also] be counted [as a full year] at the beginning?”
- P. *Then what [should we say regarding who holds that thirty days count as a year]?*
- Q. *[It cannot be] R. Eleazar, [since Eleazar] requires thirty days [for that which is planted to take root] and thirty days [more, to count as the year of growth], as we have taught on Tannaite authority [M. **Sheb. 2:6**]: “They do not plant [a tree], sink [a vine into the ground so that it emerges nearby as an independent plant], or graft [one branch to another] in the year preceding the Sabbatical within thirty days of the New Year. And if one planted [a tree], sank [a vine into the ground], or grafted [one branch to another within thirty days of the beginning of the Sabbatical year], one must uproot [that which was planted, sunk or grafted]—the words of R. Eleazar. R. Judah says, “All grafting that does not take root within three days will not take root.” R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “Within two weeks.” Now, said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “In the opinion of one [such as Eleazar], who says [the period is] thirty [days], we require thirty [days for that which is planted to take root] and thirty [more, to count as the year of growth]. In the opinion of one [such as Judah], who says [the period is] three [days], we require thirty-three [days]. In the opinion of one [such as Yosé or Simeon], who says [the period is] two weeks, we require two weeks and thirty days.”*

- R. *Now, in the same way, [is it possible that the rule] follows the perspective of R. Judah?*
- S. *[That is not tenable, since] he requires thirty-three days, [while A-D refers only to thirty days].*
- T. *Rather, in point of fact, [A-D follows] R. Meir. And when it says [the plants must be in the ground] thirty [days in order to be deemed of the year prior to the sabbatical, it refers] to [the time required for the plant to] take [root]. [In Meir's view, once the plant has taken root, which requires thirty days, only a single additional day in the ground is required for it to be deemed of the preceding year. Just as the opinion attributed to him at K states, he holds that a single day counts as a full year.]*
- U. *If that is the case, then [A-D] should require [the plant to have been put in the ground] thirty-one days [prior to the start of the Sabbatical year]!*
- V. *[Meir] reasoned that the thirtieth day counts here [as the last day required for the plant to take root] and here [as the day that is deemed a year].*
- W. Said R. Yohanan, "Now, both [authorities, Meir and Eleazar, derived their views by] interpreting the same verse of Scripture [Gen. 8:13]: 'In the one and six hundredth year, in the first month, the first day of the month, [the waters were dried from off the earth].' R. Meir reasoned, 'Since only one day had passed in the year but it still was counted as a year, we learn from this that a single day in the year can be considered a full year.' But the other [that is, Eleazar, says], 'If it were written, "In the six hundred and first year....", then, what you [Meir] say [would make sense]. 'But, since it says, "In the one and six hundredth year....", [it is clear that the word] "year" [at the end of the clause only] refers to the [number] "six hundred." 'And what, then, is the meaning of [the number] "one" [at the beginning of the clause]? It refers to the fact that it was the beginning of [year number six hundred and] one.' " [But that one day was not counted as a full year.]
- X. *Now, what is the Scriptural basis of R. Eleazar's perspective [that thirty days are considered a year]?*
- Y. For it is written [Gen. 8:13]: "In the one and six hundredth year, [in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried from off the earth]." Since only one day had passed in the month but it still was counted as a month, we learn from this that a single day in the month can be considered a full month. And since a single day in the month can be considered a month, [we must conclude that] thirty days in a year are considered a year. For [a full] month is determined based upon its [basic constituent] unit, [that is, a day]; and [a full] year is determined based upon its [basic constituent] unit, [that is, a month].
- CC. *[We can] infer [from the preceding interpretations of Gen. 8:13] that both [Meir and Eleazar] reason that the*

*world was created in Nisan.* [This is based upon the authorities' agreement that "the first month, the first day of the month" refers to the first day in the new year, in Nisan.]

### **What Does TISHRÉ Commemorate?**

The brief allusion at CC to the issue of the creation of the world in Nisan introduces the debate on that question, in a free-standing composite, which follows.

#### **VIII.3 A.** *It is taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Eliezer says, "In Tishré, the world was created; in Tishré, the patriarchs [Abraham and Jacob] were born; in Tishré, the patriarchs died; on Passover, Isaac was born; on New Year, Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were visited; on New Year, Joseph left prison; [11a] on New Year, bondage was removed from our ancestors in Egypt; in Nisan, they were redeemed; in Tishré, they are destined to be redeemed [again]."
- C. R. Joshua says, "In Nisan, the world was created; in Nisan, the patriarchs [Abraham and Jacob] were born; in Nisan, the patriarchs died; on Passover, Isaac was born; on New Year, Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were visited; on New Year, Joseph left prison; on New Year, bondage was removed from our ancestors in Egypt; in Nisan, they were redeemed; in Nisan, they are destined to be redeemed [again]."
- D. *It is taught on Tannaite authority:* R. Eliezer says, "From what Scriptural source do we know that the world was created in Tishré? For it is written [Gen. 1:11]: 'And God said, "Let the earth put forth vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees [bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, upon the earth]."' Which is the month in which the earth brings forth vegetation and the trees are full of fruit? You must say that this refers to Tishré. And this same period was the time of rainfall, and the rains came down and [plants] sprouted, as it says [Gen. 2: 6]: 'but a mist went up from the earth [and watered the whole face of the ground].'"
- E. R. Joshua says, "From what Scriptural source do we know that the world was created in Nisan? For it is written [Gen. 1:12]: 'The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed [according to their own kinds], and trees bearing fruit [in which is their seed, each according to its kind].'" Which is the month in which the earth is full of vegetation and the trees bring forth fruit? You must say that this refers to Nisan. And the same period is the time that cattle, animals, and fowl copulate, as it says [Psa. 65:13]: 'The rams have mounted the sheep.'"
- F. *But the other [authority, Eliezer] must also take account of that which is written [at Gen. 1:12]: "trees bearing fruit"!*
- G. *[For Eliezer] this [refers to] a blessing for [future] generations.*
- H. *But the other [authority, Joshua] must also take account of that which is written [at Gen. 1:11: "Let the earth put forth vegetation, plants yielding seed, and] fruit trees."*
- I. *[Joshua interprets this verse to mean that the trees were created fully matured], according to the perspective of R. Joshua b. Levi, for said R. Joshua b. Levi, "All*

things that were created in the beginning [at the time of God's original acts of creation] were created in their [full] stature, in their full capacities, and in their [full] beauty. [We know they were created in their full beauty] since it is written [Gen. 2: 4]: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all of their host (*sb'm*)."

Do not read [the word] *sb'm* [as it is written]. Rather, [read it as] *sbywnm* [that is, their beauty].

- J. R. Eliezer says, "From what verse in Scripture do we know that the patriarchs were born in Tishré? For it is written [1Ki. 8: 2]: 'And all the men of Israel assembled to King Solomon at the feast in the month Ethanim, [which is the seventh month, (that is, Tishré)].' [This means they gathered in] the month in which the mighty ones (*ethanim*) of the world [the patriarchs] were born."
- K. *How do you know that the word ethan refers to strong ones? For it is written* [Num. 24:21: "And (Balaam) looked on the Kenite and took up his discourse, and said], 'Enduring [*ethan*] is your dwelling place, [and your nest is set in the rock].'" And it says [Mic. 6: 2]: "Hear, you mountains, the controversy of the Lord, and you enduring [*ethan*] foundations of the earth."
- L. And it says [Son. 2: 8]: "The voice of my beloved! Behold, he comes, leaping upon the mountains, bounding over the hills."
- M. "Leaping upon the mountains"—through the merit of the patriarchs.
- N. "Bounding over the hills"—through the merit of the matriarchs.
- O. R. Joshua says, "From what Scriptural source do we know that the patriarchs were born in Nisan? For it is written [1Ki. 6: 1]: 'In the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year [of Solomon's reign over Israel], in the month of Ziv, [which is the second month, he began to build the house of the Lord].' [By month of Ziv is meant] the month in which the brilliant ones [*zybtny*] of the world were born."
- R. But thus it is written [1Ki. 8: 2: "And all the men of Israel assembled to King Solomon at the feast] in the month Ethanim, [which is the seventh month, (that is, Tishré)]."
- S. [Joshua holds that] there [at 1Ki. 8: 2 reference is to the month] that is strong in religious obligations.
- T. But the other [authority, Eliezer] must also take account of that which is written [at 1Ki. 6: 1]: "In the month of Ziv."
- U. *This refers to the month in which there is glory for the trees. For said R. Judah, "Anyone who goes out during the days of Nisan and sees trees in blossom should say, 'Blessed is he whose world lacks nothing and who created in it good things and nice trees in which people could find enjoyment.'"*
- W. He [that is, Joshua] who holds that [the patriarchs] were born in Nisan [holds that] they [also] died in Nisan; and he [that is, Eliezer] who holds that [the patriarchs] were born in Tishré [holds that] they [also] died in Tishré.
- X. For it is written [Deu. 31: 2]: "And [Abraham] said to them, 'I am a hundred and twenty years old this day.' There is no need for Scripture to say, "This day." Why does Scripture state, "This day"? [It means that Abraham said:] "On this day my days and years have been completed."

This teaches you that the holy one, blessed be he, sits and completes the years of the righteous from day to day and from month to month, as it is written [Exo. 23:26]: “I will complete the number of your days.”

**VIII.4** A. “Isaac was born on Passover.”

- B. *From what verse in Scripture do we know this?*
- C. It is as it is written [Gen.18:14]: “At the appointed time I will return to you, [in the spring, and Sarah shall have a son].”
- D. *When was [the messenger speaking]? Should I reason that it was Passover, and [in noting his time of return] he was referring to Pentecost? Can someone give birth after [just] fifty days? Rather, [should I reason that] he was [speaking] on Pentecost and referred to Tishré?*
- E. *Can someone give birth even after five months? Rather, [I must reason that] he was [speaking] on Tabernacles and referred to [his return at Passover, in] Nisan!*
- F. *Can someone give birth after six months?*
- G. [To solve the problem] *it is taught on Tannaite authority:* It was a leap year, [and the pregnancy lasted seven months].
- H. *Even so, when the master [behind this tradition] deducts her days of uncleanness [as a menstruant], there is not enough time [between Tabernacles and Passover for her to have conceived and given birth].*
- I. *Said Mar Zutra, “Even one who holds that [a woman who] gives birth after nine months does not give birth after a partial month [recognizes that] one who gives birth after seven months might [even] give birth after part [of the sixth] month [has passed]. [The reference to a seven month pregnancy encompasses a pregnancy of only six months and some number of days. Accordingly, the fact that, at Tabernacles, Sarah was menstruating and could not conceive until some days later does not preclude Isaac’s birth at Passover.] [We know that one who gives birth after seven months might give birth before the seventh month is complete, M], as it is written [1Sa. 1:20]: ‘And after a period of days [Hannah conceived and bore a son].’ [Interpret this as follows:] The minimum [time deemed a] period is two, and minimum [number of] days [referred to by the plural] is [comparably] two.”*

**VIII.5** A. “On New Year, Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were visited.”

- B. *From what verse in Scripture do we know this?*
- C. *Said R. Eleazar, “It is derived from an analogy [between the appearance of the term] ‘visiting’ [at 1Sa. 2:21 and the appearance of the term] ‘visiting’ [again at Gen. 21: 1]. It [further] is derived from an analogy [between the appearance of the term] ‘remembering’ [at Gen. 30:22 and the appearance of the term] ‘remembering’ [again at 1Sa. 1:19]. It is written concerning Rachel [Gen. 30:22]:*

“Then God remembered Rachel. And it is written concerning Hannah [1Sa. 1:19: “And Elkanah knew Hannah his wife], and the Lord remembered her. Now, [these mentions of] “remembering” are analogous to [the use of the term] “remembering” in conjunction with New Year. For it is written [Lev. 23:24: “On the first day of the month, you shall observe] a day of solemn rest, a *memorial* proclaimed with the blast of trumpets.”

- D. [There is an analogy between the appearance of the term] ‘visiting’ [at 1Sa. 2:21 and the appearance of the term] ‘visiting’ [again at Gen. 21: 1]: It is written concerning Hannah [1Sa. 2:21]: “And the Lord visited Hannah, [and she conceived and bore three sons and two daughters].” And it is written concerning Sarah [Gen. 21: 1]: “The Lord visited Sarah.”

### **VIII.6 A.** “On New Year, Joseph left prison.”

- B. *From what verse in Scripture do we know this?*

- C. It is written [Psa. 81: 3-5]: “Blow the trumpet at the new moon, when the moon is covered, on our feast day. For it is a statute for Israel, [an ordinance of the God of Jacob]. **[11b]** He made it a decree in Joseph, when he went out [over the land of Egypt].”

- D. “On New Year, bondage was removed from our ancestors in Egypt.”

- E. It is written here [Exo. 6: 6: “I am the Lord], and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.” And it is written there [Psa. 81: 6, in reference to Joseph]: “I relieved your shoulder of the burden.” [Psa. 81: 6, the continuation of the passage cited in the preceding unit, suggests that “burdens” are removed on New Year. The release from bondage, described by Exo. 6: 6 as a removal of “burdens,” accordingly must also have taken place on New Year.]

- F. “In Nisan, they were redeemed.”

- G. *This is as is known.*

- H. “In Tishré, they are destined to be redeemed [again].”

- I. *This is derived from an analogy [between the appearance of the term] “trumpet” [at Psa. 81: 3 and the appearance of the term] “trumpet” [again at Isa. 27:13]. Here it is written [Psa. 81: 3, in reference to New Year, in Tishré]: “Blow the trumpet at the new moon.” And there it is written [Isa. 27:13, in reference to the final redemption]: “And on that day a great trumpet will be blown.”*



- J. R. Joshua says, "In Nisan they were redeemed [from Egypt], and in Nisan they are destined to be redeemed [again]."
- K. *From what verse in Scripture does we know this?*
- L. Scripture [at Exo. 12:42] says [regarding Passover that], "It was a night of watching." [This means it was] a night that was continually watched for [root: SMR] since the six days of creation.
- M. *But [as for] the other [that is, Eliezer, who holds that the final redemption will occur in Tishré, how does he interpret Exo. 12:42]?*
- N. [He holds that reference is to] a night under continuous protection [root: SMR] against damaging demons.
- O. *[Eliezer and Joshua] are consistent with views they hold elsewhere. For it is taught on Tannaite authority: [Gen. 7:11 states]: "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, [on that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened]."*
- P. R. Joshua says, "That day was the seventeenth of Iyyar, the day on which the constellation Draco sets at dawn and the fountains [begin to] dry up [that is, the rainy season ends]. But because [human beings] changed [that is, perverted] their ways, the holy one, blessed be he, changed on them the order of creation and made the constellation Draco rise at day[-break], and took two stars from Draco, and brought a flood upon the world."
- Q. R. Eliezer says, "That day was the seventeenth of Marheshvan, the day on which the constellation Draco rises at day[-break] and the fountains [begin to] fill [that is, the rains begin]. **[12a]** But because [human beings] changed [that is, perverted] their ways, the holy one, blessed be he, changed on them the order of creation and made the constellation Draco rise at day[-break], and took two stars [from Draco], and brought a flood upon the world."
- R. *Granted [that the view of] R. Joshua, [that the flood began in Iyyar, makes sense]. For this is why it is written [at Gen. 7:11: "In the] second [month]."* [This is within Scripture's understanding that Nisan [= Abib] is the first month. The flood thus began in Iyyar, the second month.] *But, in [the view of] R. Eliezer, what [is the meaning of], "second"?*
- S. [Eliezer holds that it means] second to [the month containing the day of] judgment [that is, Tishré].
- T. *Granted [that the view of] R. Joshua, [that the flood began in Iyyar, makes sense]. For [in this view God did] change*

*[the order of creation]. [At the point at which the dry season normally begin, God started the flood.] But, in [the view of] R. Eliezer, what did God change? [This is a question because, in Eliezer's view, it already was the rainy season. The following responds by suggesting that, in Eliezer's view, God made the rains boil.]*

U. *[Eliezer's position] accords with the view of Rav Hisda, for Rav Hisda said, "With boiling liquid they sinned, and with boiling liquid they were judged."*

V. "With boiling liquid they sinned"—through [sexual] transgression.

W. "And with boiling liquid they were judged"—[this is as follows]:

X. Here it is written [Gen. 8: 1, referring to the flood]: "And the waters abated."

Y. And there it is written [Est. 7:10]: "Then the anger [lit: heat] of the king abated."

**VIII.7 A.** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* The sages of Israel date [the calendar from] the flood, in accordance with the view of R. Eliezer, but [date the four] annual cycles according to the view of R. Joshua.

B. The sages of other peoples date even the flood in accordance with the view of R. Joshua, [holding that the New Year for years is in Nisan].

**IX.1 A.** **[The first day of Tishré is the new year for the reckoning of years, for Sabbatical years, and for Jubilees, for planting trees] and for vegetables [M. R.H. 1:1E-F]:**

B. *It is taught on Tannaite authority:* [The first of Tishré is the new year] for vegetables, tithes, and vows. [See T. **R.H. 1:7**, which explicitly states that the first of Tishré is the new year for tithes and vows.]

C. "For vegetables"—*what is the meaning [of this rule]?* [If reference is to the separation of] tithes from vegetables, [the point is the same as is made by the inclusion here of the term] "tithes." [The point in either case would be that vegetables picked prior to the first of Tishré may not be designated tithes on behalf of vegetables picked after the first of Tishré, or *vice versa*. Since the term "vegetables" here must have a distinctive meaning, it cannot refer to the rules for the separation of tithes.]

D. *[By mentioning "vegetables," the list first] teaches on Tannaite authority [the rule for a tithe imposed] by the rabbis. And [then, by referring to "tithes" in general] it teaches [the rule for tithes imposed] by Scripture.*

E. *[If this indeed is the meaning], it should refer first to [the tithes imposed by] Scripture! [The fact that it does not suggests that E's interpretation is incorrect.]*

F. *Since he liked this [Rabbinic rule], he placed it first!*

G. *[If at stake are both "tithes" and "vegetables,] as to our Tannaite authority [behind M. **R.H. 1:1F**—why did he only mention "vegetables"]?*

- H. *He taught the Rabbinic rule [to make the point that], all the more so, [this same rule, prohibiting designating produce picked prior to the first of Tishré as tithes for produce picked after that date, applies to tithes imposed by] Scripture.*
- I. *[If the term “tithes” in fact refers only to the tithe imposed by Scripture, but not to tithes enacted by Rabbinic authorities, the author] should have mentioned “tithe” [in the singular].*
- J. *[His point was that] the same rule applies to the tithe of cattle and to the tithe of grain, [both of which are imposed by Scripture].*
- K. *[If the term in fact refers only to the tithe imposed by the rabbis, but not to that enacted by Scripture, the author] should have mentioned “vegetable” [in the singular].*
- L. *[The reference is in the plural since] there are two types of vegetables, as we have taught on Tannaite authority [M. Ma. 1:5: **At what point after the harvest must tithes be removed from produce?**] ... **Green vegetables which are [normally] tied in bunches—after he ties [them]. But if he does not tie them, [tithes need not be removed] until the vessel [into which he places the picked greens] is filled.***

**IX.2 A.** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. R.H. 1:9]:*

- B. **If one picked vegetables on the eve of the new year before sunset and went back and picked [more] [12b] after sunset, they do not designate heave-offering or tithes from this [batch] on behalf of that [other] batch,** since they do not designate that which is new as heave-offering and tithes on behalf of that which is old, and do not [designate that which is] old [as heave-offering and tithes] on behalf of that which is new.
- C. **If it was the second year of the Sabbatical cycle and the third year was beginning, [that which was picked before New Year], in the second year, [is subject to the separation of] first tithe and second tithe; [that which was picked after New Year], in the third year, [is subject to the separation of] first tithe and poor-man’s tithe.**
- D. *What is the Scriptural foundation of these rules?*
- E. Rabbi Joshua b. Levi said, “[Deu. 26:12 states]: ‘When you have finished paying all the tithe of your produce in the third year, which is the year of the tithe....’ [This suggests that in the third] year [one separates] only one [of the two] tithe[s separated in the first and second years of the Sabbatical cycle].”
- F. How should he do it? [Does he designate] first tithe and poor man’s tithe, but second tithe is omitted? Or [is it the case that] first tithe also is omitted [so that only one tithe is designated at all]?
- G. [To prove that first tithe is not omitted] Scripture states [Num. 18:26]: “Moreover you shall speak to the Levites and say to them, ‘When you take from the people of Israel the tithe which I have given you from them for your inheritance, [then you shall present an offering from it to the Lord, a tithe of the tithe].’”
- H. Scripture equates [first tithe] with an inheritance. Just as an inheritance is never interrupted, so first tithe is not interrupted.
- I. *A Tannaite statement makes the same point:* [Deu. 26:12 states]: “When you have finished paying all the tithe [of your produce in the third year]....”

[This suggests that in the third] year [one separates] only one [of the two] tithe[s separated in the first and second years of the Sabbatical cycle]. How should he do it? [Does he designate] first tithe and poor man's tithe, but second tithe is omitted? Or is it possible that first tithe also is omitted [so that only one tithe is designated at all]?

- J. "Scripture states [Deu. 14:29]: 'And the Levite shall come [... and eat and be filled].' [This means that] each time he comes, [even in the third year], you must give him [his tithe]"—the words of R. Judah.
- K. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, "We do not need [to appeal to the text cited at R]."
- L. "For [at Num. 18:26] it says, 'Moreover you shall speak to the Levites and say to them, "When you take from the people of Israel the tithe which I have given you from them for your inheritance, [then you shall present an offering from it to the Lord, a tithe of the tithe]."' Scripture equates [first tithe] with an inheritance. Just as an inheritance is never interrupted, so first tithe is not interrupted."

### IX.3 A. And for vows [with reference to IX.1]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority [T. R.H. 1:10, with variations]:*
- C. **One who took a vow not to derive benefit from his fellow for a year reckons [as the period of prohibition] twelve month from the day [of the vow] to the [same] day [a year later]. But if he said, "[The vow is for] this year," [then] even if he took it only on the twenty-ninth of Elul, once the first of Tishré arrived, his year is up.**
  - D. *[This applies/] even [in the opinion] of one who says, "A single day in the year cannot be counted as a [full] year." [The reason that all deem the period of the vow to be up is that] he undertook [the vow] to degrade himself, and, lo, he already has degraded himself.*
    - E. *[Why, for this purpose, is the first of Tishré is considered the new year?] But why not say [that for vows] Nisan [is the new year]?*
    - F. *In the case of vows, follow people's normal usage!*

### IX.4 A. There we have taught on Tannaite authority: [M. Ma. 1:3, referring to the point at which produce becomes subject to tithes]: **fenugreek—when the seeds [are able to] sprout; grain and olives—when they reach a third [of their mature growth].**

- B. *What is referred to by [the phrase] when the seeds [are able to] sprout?*
- C. [This means] from the point at which it sprouts [sufficiently to be used] for seed. **Grain and olives—when they reach a third [of their mature growth].**
- D. *What is the scriptural basis of these rules?*
- E. Said Rab Assi said R. Yohanan, *though some teach this in the name of R. Yosé the Galilean*, "Scripture said [Deu. 31:10: 'And Moses commanded them], 'At the end of every seven years, at the time of the year of release, at the feast of tabernacles, [when all Israel comes to appear before the Lord your God at the place which he will choose, you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing].' *What is [the reference to] 'the feast of tabernacles' doing here? [Since we are speaking of events to take place 'at the end of every seven years,' the feast of tabernacles will be in] the eighth year!* Rather, it is to teach you: [as for] all grain that reaches a

third of its growth in the seventh year prior to New Year—in the eighth year, [when you harvest it], you treat it according to the rules for the Sabbatical year.”

- H. *Said R. Zera to Rav Assi, [13a] “But perhaps [this refers even to a case in which the produce] has not begun to ripen at all. But [even so] the Merciful has said, ‘[In the eighth year, when it has ripened and is harvested], treat it as subject to the rules of the Sabbatical year until the festival of tabernacles.’”*
- I. *Do not even think that, for it is written [Exo. 23:16]: “[You shall keep] the feast of ingathering at the end of the year, [when you gather in from the field the fruit of your labor].” What is the meaning of the term “ingathering”? Might I say it refers to the festival that comes at the time of the harvest? This [already is indicated by] that which is written [in the continuation of the verse]: ‘When you gather in [from the field the fruit of your labor].’ Rather, what is the meaning of ‘ingathering’? Harvesting. [Simon: The implication is that what is harvested at this time of year is deemed to be of the same, not the following, year.] But the rabbis were certain that all grain that is harvested at the festival [of tabernacles] certainly had reached a third [of its growth] by New Year; and indeed [Exo. 23:16] refers to it [with the words] at the end of the year.”*
- J. *Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zera, “Were the rabbis [indeed] certain [that a distinction could be made] between [that which had reached] a third [of its growth] and [that which had] not [reached] a third [of its growth, so that one could be assigned to one year of the cycle and the other to a different year]?”*
- K. *[Zera] said to him, “Have I not told you not to place yourself outside of the established law? All measures established by the sages are comparable to this, [that is, all reflect very slight distinctions]. [To remove uncleanness] one immerses in forty seahs of water; in forty seahs less one qortab, one may not immerse. An egg’s volume [of food] has the capacity to convey uncleanness of foods; an egg’s volume less [the volume of] a sesame seed does not have the capacity to convey uncleanness of foods. [A piece of cloth] three-by-three handbreadths [in size] has the capacity to contract uncleanness by reason of a sitting or lying person afflicted with a flux [see Lev. 15]; [a piece of cloth] three-by-three handbreadths less a [single] thread does not have the capacity to contract uncleanness by reason of a sitting or lying person afflicted with a flux.”*
- L. *Jeremiah reversed [himself and] said, “That which I said is of no weight. For the associates asked Rav Kahana: [As for] the first sheaf [omer] that the Israelites offered upon their entry into the land [of Israel]—where did they get it? If you say it grew in the possession of the gentile [inhabitants of the land, this would be impossible, since] the Merciful [at Lev. 23:10] states: ‘[When you come into the land that I give you and reap its harvest, you shall bring to the priest the sheaf of the first fruits of] your harvest.’ [This reference to ‘your harvest’ means that the sheaf may] not [come] from the harvest of gentiles.”*
- M. *How do you know that [upon their entry] they offered [a first sheaf at all]? Perhaps they did not offer it!*
- N. *Do not [even] imagine [such a thing], for it is written [Jos. 5:11]: “And they ate of the produce of the land, on the day after the Passover, [on that very day, unleavened cakes and parched grain].” [The text states that] on the day after the Passover they ate [the produce of the land]. At first they*

*did not eat [this produce. This suggests that] they offered the first sheaf and [only] then went and ate [the land's produce].*

- P. *[As for the first sheaf that the Israelites offered upon their entry into the land of Israel]—where did they get it?*
- Q. *[Kahana] said to them [that is, the associates], “All that had not reached a third [of its growth] in the possession of gentiles [was appropriate for the first sheaf].” [Produce that reached a third of its growth in Israelite hands was deemed Israelite grain and was used as the first sheaf.]*
- R. *But perhaps [one should think that the grain] had grown and it was not certain [whether or not it had reached a third of its growth in gentile hands].*
- S. *This is not so. [Since, after Passover, they ate the food of the land] they indeed were certain [that what they had offered as the first sheaf had not reached a third of its growth in gentile hands]. Here too [in the case of the grain harvested at tabernacles], they are certain [of when the produce reaches a third of its growth].*
- U. *But perhaps [at the point at which the Israelites entered the land, the grain that eventually would be used for the first sheaf] had not [started to] grow at all.*
- V. *[If matters are so, one can argue] however [that] in the case [of grain] which had [upon the Israelites' entry into the land already] reached a quarter [of its total growth], whether it had reached a third of its growth or still was at less than a third was unclear to them, [so that such grain was not used for the first sheaf at all].*
- W. *Do not [even] imagine [such a thing], for it is written [Jos. 4:19]: “The people came up out of the Jordan on the tenth day of the month.” Now, if you think that [upon their entry into the land, the grain that was to become the first sheaf] had not [yet started to] grow at all—in five days could it [grow and] become ripe, [so as to be ready for offering immediately after Passover]? [This clearly is impossible. Hence we must conclude that the grain used for the first sheaf was growing under gentile ownership prior to the Israelites' entry into the land, and that, beginning with produce that had reached a quarter of its growth, the people were able to distinguish the point at which it achieved a third of its growth and could be used for the offering.]*
- X. *But [even as for] that which had grown a fourth or a sixth [at the time of the Israelites' entry into the land]—can it complete its ripening in five days? [To respond to U's argument] what can you say?*
- Y. *[The land of Israel] is called [Dan. 11:16], “The land of the gazelle.” In this matter too, it is called, “The land of the gazelle.”*

**IX.5 A.** [At Exo. 23:16, the word “ingathering” means “harvest,” and serves to support the rabbis' rule regarding the significance of produce's reaching a third of its mature growth.] *[Responding to that interpretation] R. Hanina objected, “How can you say that this ‘ingathering’ is the ‘harvest’? For [indicating a contrary meaning] it is written [Deu. 16:13: ‘You shall keep the feast of tabernacles seven days], when you make your ingathering from your threshing floor and your wine press.’ Now, [explaining this verse] a master said, “[With the word “ingathering”] Scripture*



speaks of what is left on the threshing floor and of the dregs of the wine press.” [See b. **Suk. 12a**. The point is that these things are appropriate roofing material for a booth used on Tabernacles. Accordingly, the term “ingathering” refers to a period much later than the harvest and cannot be used to support the rabbis’ understanding of the significance of produce’s reaching a third of its mature growth.]

- B. *Said R. Zera, “We had a firm proposition in hand, but R. Hanina came and threw an ax at it! Rather, from what verse in Scripture do we know [the rule about the third of produce’s growth]? As it is taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yohanan b. Joseph says, “[Lev. 25:21 states]: ‘[I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year], so that it will bring forth fruit for three years.’ [The produce of the sixth year, that is, will suffice to feed the people in the sixth, seventh, and eighth years of the Sabbatical cycle, until the produce that begins to grow after the Sabbatical year is ripe and available for consumption, in the ninth year.] [13b] Do not read [the verse as it actually is written]: ‘for three years.’ Rather, [by adding one letter, read it as though it said]: ‘for a third.’” [In this reading, the point of the verse is that produce is deemed ripe when it has reached a third of its mature growth.]*
- C. *But, do we not need this verse to [express] its literal meaning, [that the sixth year will provide enough food for three years]!?*
- D. *A different verse [Lev. 25:22] states: “When you sow in the eighth year, you will be eating old produce. Until the ninth year, [when its produce comes in, you shall eat the old].” [Like Lev. 25:21, Lev. 25:22 indicates that the produce of the sixth year will last three years. Accordingly, Lev. 25:21 can be used to support a different proposition. It is not needed for its literal meaning.]*

**IX.6** A. *There we have taught on Tannaite authority [M. **Sheb. 2:7**:]*

- B. **Once harvested] rice, durra, millet, and sesame that took root before New Year [of any year in the Sabbatical cycle] are tithed according to the [rules that apply to produce of the] previous year [in which they were planted].**
- C. **And [if they were planted in the sixth year], they are permitted during the Sabbatical year. [Even though these items are picked during the Sabbatical, they are subject to the rules of the sixth year, in which they took root. This is just as A states.] But if [they did] not [take root before the New Year, but during the Sabbatical year itself], they are forbidden during the Sabbatical year [under the Sabbatical restrictions, as we would expect]. And they are tithed according to the [rule which applies to produce of the] year following [the one in which they were planted]. [They are tithed, that is to say, according to the rule for the year in which they take root, just as the preceding rules already have indicated.]**

- D. *Said Rabbah, “The rabbis state that [the tithing year for fruit of] a tree is determined by when it blossoms; [the tithing year for] grain and olives is determined by when they reach a third [of their growth; the tithing year for] vegetables is determined by when they are picked. As for these [types of produce listed at A]: to which [of the types indicated at E] did the rabbis deem them comparable?”*
- E. *Rabbah went ahead and, [answering his own question], said, “Since [the items listed at A] are prepared by being husked, [in determining when they become subject to tithes], the rabbis followed the point at which they take root.”* [Simon: Otherwise it would be impossible to keep old and new produce separate for purposes of the removal of tithes.]
- F. [Arguing that, for purposes of separating tithes, the old and new produce need not be kept distinct at all], said to him Abbaye, “But let him [simply] pile [all of the harvest] on his threshing floor, so that, as a result, he separates from the new produce as tithes for the new, and from the old produce as tithes for the old. [A mixture containing old and new produce can be designated heave-offering and tithes on behalf of the rest of the produce on the threshing floor, which comparably contains old and new produce.] *For [indicating the validity of this procedure] we taught on Tannaite authority* [T. **Sheb. 2:5**]: **R. Yosé b. Kiper said in the name of R. Simeon Shezuri**, ‘[As for] Egyptian beans which one sowed for seed, a portion of which took root prior to the new year and a portion of which took root after new year—they may not separate heave-offering and tithes from this portion for that portion, since they do not separate heave-offering and tithes from that which is new on behalf of that which is old or from that which is old on behalf of that which is new. What should he do? **He gathers his crop [which includes the produce of the two different years] on [the threshing floor] and, as a result, separates heave-offering and tithes from the new produce as tithes for the new, and from the old produce as tithes for the old.**”
- G. *[Rabbah] said to him [that is, to Abbaye], “[To explain the position of the rabbis] you cite Simeon Shezuri!! [That is illogical since] R. Simeon Shezuri reasons that [complete] mixing [occurs, so that what is separated as heave-offering and tithes is exactly the same as the produce on behalf of which it is separated]. But the rabbis reason that [complete] mixing does not [occur, so that the procedure described at H+I-K is unacceptable].”*
- H. Said R. Isaac bar Nahmani, said Samuel, “The decided law follows [the view of] R. Yosé b. Kiper, who spoke in the name of R. Simeon Shezuri.”
- I. *R. Zera objected, “Now, did Samuel really say this? Rather, thus said Samuel, “[Completing] mixing does not occur except [in the case] of wine and oil.”*
- J. *[Zera] forgot the following, which Samuel said: “In all cases [the year for tithing] follows [the point at which] the produce is ripened.”* [Samuel thus agrees with Simeon Shezuri that Egyptian beans that rooted before and after new year may be tithed together. But his reasoning is different from that of Simeon Shezuri, who holds that this may be done despite the fact that the mixture contains bean’s subject to the rules of different years of the Sabbatical cycle. Samuel, by contrast, deems the beans all to be subject to the same law. While Samuel agrees with

Simeon Shezuri about the law, his statement therefore cannot be used to support Simeon's legal premise regarding mixtures.]

- K. **[14a]** *Now, [each of these three statements] is necessary [in order fully to express Samuel's view]. For if we were taught [only as at N, that, in Samuel's view] the decided law follows [the perspective of] R. Simeon Shezuri, we would have thought it is because [Samuel] reasons that [complete] mixing occurs. Therefore we must be instructed [that in Samuel's view] in all [cases complete] mixing does not occur.*
- L. *And if we were taught [only that, in Samuel's view] in all [cases complete] mixing does not occur, we would have thought that he concurs with rabbis, [who say that combinations of produce never are treated as completely mixed]. Therefore we must be instructed, [that in Samuel's view] the decided law follows [the perspective of] R. Simeon Shezuri, [who, as we know, holds that we can depend upon mixing].*
- M. *And if we had taught [only] these two [rules], we would have thought that the positions of Samuel are contradictory. [The contradiction would be evidence in Samuel's statements that, on the one hand, mixing cannot be relied on, but that, on the other, the law follows Simeon Shezuri, which suggests that mixing can be relied on.] Therefore we must be informed, [that], "In all cases [the year for tithing] follows [the point at which] the produce is ripened."*
- O. *Now, if we were taught [only that] in all cases [the year for tithing] follows [the point at which] the produce is ripened, we would have thought [that, in Samuel's view, this applies] even [in the case of] produce and olives. Therefore we must be instructed, [that in Samuel's view] the decided law follows [the perspective of] R. Simeon Shezuri even in the case in which he disagrees.*
- T. *Now, [it appears as though] we need be taught [only] these two rules, [that, in Samuel's view, the law follows the position of Simeon Shezuri and that produce is tithed according to the year in which it ripens]. [As for the rule which states] that, "In all [cases complete] mixing does not occur"—why do I need it? [The rules expressed explicitly at N and Q seem to make this statement unnecessary.]*
- U. *It is needed to instruct us that, in the case of wine and oil, [complete] mixing does occur.*

**IX.7 A.** *It is taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Yosé the Galilean says, "[Deu. 16:13 states: 'You shall keep the feast of tabernacles seven days], when you make your ingathering from your threshing floor and your wine press.' [This suggests that] just as [the produce on] the threshing floor and in the wine press, which is distinguished by having grown as a result of the waters [that is, rains and irrigation] of the past year, is tithed [according to the rules that applied] in that [same] past year, so every kind [of produce] that grows as a result of the waters of the past year is tithed [according to the rules that applied] in that past year. This excludes [from this rule] vegetables, which grow from the water of the coming year [after the one in which

they are planted] and which are tithed [according to the rules that apply] in that [same] coming year.”

- C. R. Aqiba says, “[Deu. 16:13 states: ‘You shall keep the feast of tabernacles seven days], when you make your ingathering from your threshing floor and your wine press.’ [This suggests that] just as [the produce on] the threshing floor and in the wine press, which is distinguished by having grown as a result of the rains [but not irrigation] of the past year, is tithed [according to the rules that applied] in that [same] past year, so every kind [of produce] that grows as a result of the rains [of the past year] is tithed [according to the rules that applied] in that past year. This excludes [from this rule] vegetables, which grow from all the water [that is, rain and irrigation] and which are tithed [according to the rules that apply] in the coming year.”
- D. *In what case is there a practical difference between these [two views]?*
- E. *Said R. Abbahu, “[In the case of] seedless onions and Egyptian beans. For we have taught on Tannaite authority [M. **Sheb. 2:9**]: **Seedless onions and Egyptian beans that one deprived of water thirty days before the New Year are tithed according to the [rule which applies to produce of the] previous year. And [if they were planted in the sixth year of the Sabbatical cycle] they are permitted during the Sabbatical year. But if [one did] not [deprive them of water within thirty days of the New Year of the Sabbatical year], they are forbidden during the Sabbatical year. And [if they were watered close to New Year in any year of the Sabbatical cycle other than the sixth], they are tithed according to the [rule which applies to produce of the] following year.**”*

[The way in which this passage responds to the question posed at I depends upon our understanding of the significance of “depriving the produce of water.” Simon, pp. 51-52, cites two possibilities proposed by Rashi as follows: “According to one opinion, if these vegetables have been kept without water for the last thirty days of the outgoing year, then R. Jose would hold that they must have been nurtured by the rain water of that year, and so are to be tithed for that year; whereas R. Aqiba would hold that their growth is due in part to irrigation, and so they would be tithed for the next year; and the Mishnah quoted follows R. Jose. The other opinion is that as they have not been irrigated for thirty days, it is R. Aqiba and not R. Jose who would hold that they have been nurtured by the rain of the outgoing year, and the Mishnah therefore follows R. Aqiba.]

- X.1 A. The first day of Shevat is the new year for trees, [in accord with the opinion of the House of Shammai. The House of Hillel say, “On the fifteenth day of that month (is the new year for trees)” [M. **R.H. 1:1G-H**].**
- B. *What is the reason?*
- C. Said R. Eleazar said R. Oshaiah, “It is because [by then] most of the year’s rain has passed, but the greater part of the cycle [of the winter solstice] is still to come.”
- D. *What does this mean?*

- E. *It means this:* Even though the greater part of the cycle is still to come, since most of the year's rain has passed....

**X.2 A.** *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. An incident occurred concerning R. Aqiba, who picked a citron on the first of Shevat and treated it [as subject] to two tithes, [14b] one which followed the teaching of the House of Shammai, [M. **R.H. 1:1G**], and the other following the teaching of the House of Hillel, [M. **R.H. 1:1H**]. [Aqiba separated poor tithe, required by the Shammaites for the third year, as well as second tithe, required by the Hillelites for the second year.]
- C. [R. Yosé bar Judah says, “[In separating two tithes, Aqiba] did not follow the practices required by [the distinct perspectives of] the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel.
- D. “Rather, he followed the practices required by [the distinct perspectives of] Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer.
- E. “*For we have taught on Tannaite authority* [M. **Bik. 2:6**]: **A citron [tree] is like a tree in three ways, and like a vegetable in one way. “It is like a tree in [the laws] of orlah, the Fourth [Year], and the Sabbatical [year]. And [it is like] a vegetable [in one way]: ‘that it is tithed in accordance with the year in which it is picked’—the words of Rabban Gamaliel. R. Eliezer says, ‘It is like a tree in every way, [so that its tithing year follows the point at which it blossoms].”** [Yosé bar Judah explains Aqiba's actions as follows: Following the view of Gamaliel, H, he separated poor tithe, which applies in the third year, in which the citron was picked; in line with the perspective of Eliezer, he also separated second tithe, always separated in the second year, in which the tree blossomed.]
- F. *But [as a matter of principle] do we [in fact] follow two stringencies? [That is, should Aqiba have accepted the burden of two tithes, following both the Hillelite and Shammaite views?] For [to the contrary] it is taught on Tannaite authority* [T. **Ed. 2:3**, with variations]: **The decided law follows the opinion of the House of Hillel. But one who wishes to follow the position of the House of Shammai may do so, [and one who wishes to follow] the opinion of the House of Hillel may do so. But [one who follows] the lenient positions of the House of Shammai and the lenient positions of the House of Hillel is evil. And [as for one who follows] the stringent positions of the House of Shammai and the stringent positions of the House of Hillel—concerning him Scripture states [Qoh. 2:14]: “The fool walks in darkness.” Rather, if [the person acts] in accord with the House of Shammai, [let him follow] both their lenient and strict rulings; and if [the person acts] in accord with the House of Hillel, [let him follow] both their lenient and strict rulings.**
- G. *R. Aqiba was in doubt [regarding the Hillelite's position], and he did not know if the House of Hillel said [that the new year for trees is on] the first of Shevat or on the fifteenth of Shevat.*

**X.3 A.** R. Yosé bar Judah says, “[In separating two tithes, Aqiba] did not follow the practices required by [the distinct perspectives of] the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel. Rather, he followed the practices

required by [the distinct perspectives of] Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer [at M. **Bik. 2:6**].”

- B. [At issue is whether Yosé bar Judah’s statement completely explains what Aqiba did.] [Since the citron was picked] on the first of Shevat, [would Yosé bar Judah not hold that, in separating tithes required for the third year, Aqiba] followed the perspective of the House of Shammai? [In tithing the citron for the third year, Aqiba clearly followed Gamaliel’s view, that the citron is subject to tithing according to the year in which it is picked. But it further should be clear that Aqiba interpreted Gamaliel’s view in conjunction with that of the Shammaites. They hold that the new year for trees is on the first of Shevat, so that the citron Aqiba picked in fact was picked in the third year. In the Hillelite perspective, which holds that the new year for trees is on the fifteenth of Shevat, even if tithed according to when it is picked, this citron would be treated as second year produce.]
- C. *[Rejecting B], said R. Hanina, and some say it was R. Hanania, “In this [case] we deal with a citron tree that blossomed [in the second year] before [the preceding] fifteenth [of Shevat], and the same principle would have been at issue [even if Aqiba had picked the fruit] earlier [than the first of the following Shevat]. But the way the story is told is how it actually happened.” [Aqiba’s picking of the fruit on the first of Shevat is irrelevant to the principle at issue here. Contrary to B, Aqiba accepted the Hillelite view, that the new year for trees is on the fifteenth of Shevat. In the case of a citron that blossomed prior to the fifteenth of Shevat, he tithed it according to the rules for the second year, in which it blossomed (= Eliezer) and according to the procedure for the third year, in which the produce was picked (= Gamaliel).]*
- D. *Rabina said, “Combine [the two versions of the case into one] and teach [that Aqiba did] not [pick the produce] on the first of Shevat but, rather, on the fifteenth of Shevat, and that he did not follow the practices required by [the distinct perspectives of] the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel, but, rather, he followed the practices required by Rabban Gamaliel and R. Eliezer. [The tree blossomed before the fifteenth of Shevat in one year and the fruit was picked after the fifteenth of Shevat of the following year. In this circumstance, in the views of both Houses, the produce began growing in the second year and was picked in the third year. The issue disputed by the Houses, of the exact date on which the new year for trees begins, therefore was irrelevant here. Of concern only was whether the produce is to be tithed in accordance with when the tree blossomed—here, the second year—or in line with when the fruit was picked—here the third year. Accepting the perspectives of both Gamaliel and Eliezer, Aqiba followed both possibilities.]*

**X.4 A.** *Said Rabbah bar Rav Huna, “Insofar as Rabban Gamaliel said [that], like a vegetable, a citron is tithed according to when it is picked, [he*



*further should hold that, like a vegetable] its new year is on [the first of] Tishré.”*

- B. *They objected [citing T. R.H. 1:9]: R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, “If one picked a citron on the eve of the fifteenth of Shevat before sunset and then went and picked another one after sunset, they do not separate heave-offering and tithes from this one [gathered before sunset] on behalf of that one [gathered after sunset, or vice versa], since they do not separate heave-offering or tithes from new produce on behalf of old produce or from old produce on behalf of new produce. If it was third year [of the Sabbatical cycle] and the fourth year was beginning, that which was [picked in] the third year [is subject to] first tithe and poor tithe, [and that which was picked in] the fourth year [is subject to] first tithe and second tithe. [15a] Who teaches that [the tithing year of a citron] follows [the point at which it is] picked? Rabban Gamaliel. [Since this is his view, Gamaliel apparently stands behind M. R.H. 19, just cited, which comparably deems the citron to be subject to tithing according to the point at which it is picked.] But [at T. R.H. 1:9] he teaches [explicitly that the citron’s new year is] Shevat!”*
- C. *Rather, if it was said [at all], thus it was phrased: Said Rabbah bar Rav Huna, “Even though Rabban Gamaliel said [that], like a vegetable, a citron [is tithed] according to when it is picked, [he holds that, like other trees] its new year is in Shevat.”*
- D. *Why in the former statement do we learn on Tannaite authority [of a case in which] it was the second year [of the Sabbatical cycle] and the third year began, whereas, in the current instance we learn on Tannaite authority [of a case in which] it was the third year [of the Sabbatical cycle] and the fourth year began?*
- E. *[In this way] we incidentally are taught an [additional] rule, that handling is hard on a citron tree, and since everyone handles it during the Sabbatical year [during which, like all trees, it is deemed common property], it does not produce fruit until the third year [after blossoming].*

**X.5 A.** *R. Yohanan asked R. Yannai, “[As for] the citron tree—when is its new year?”*

- B. *[Yannai] said to him, “Shevat.”*
- C. *[Yohanan questioned further, “By ‘Shevat’ do you mean] Shevat of the [calendar of] months, or Shevat of the cycle [of four yearly periods].” [The year is perceived as comprised of four cycles: the vernal equinox, beginning in Nisan; the summer solstice, beginning in Tamuz; the autumn equinox, beginning in Tishré; and the winter solstice, beginning in Tevet. Shevat of the cycle refers to the period beginning thirty days from the winter solstice, in the cycle of Tevet.]*
- D. *[Yannai] said to him, “[Shevat] of the [calendar of] months.”*

**X.6 A.** *Rava asked Rav Nahman, and some say R. Yohanan [asked] R. Yannai, “[As for] a leap year—what is the rule?” [Simon, p. 55, following Rashi:*

Do we make the New Year in Shebat which comes next to Tebeth, or in First Adar, which takes the place of Shevat in this year?]

- B. [Nahman] said to him, “Follow [the rule for] ordinary years, [observing this new year in Shevat].”

**X.7** A. Said Rabbah, “A citron [that blossomed] in the sixth year [of the Sabbatical cycle] that continued growing in the Sabbatical year is exempt from tithing and is exempt from removal. [Insofar as it is picked during the Sabbatical year, the citron is treated as Sabbatical produce, exempt from tithes. But since it blossomed prior to the Sabbatical year, it is not treated entirely like Sabbatical produce. Even after other produce of its type ceases to be available in the fields, freely to all people, individuals need not remove from storage in their homes citrons of the Sabbatical year that they have stocked for themselves.]

- B. “And a citron [that blossomed] in the Sabbatical year that continued growing in the eighth year is exempt from tithing but is subject to removal.” [We treat this citron as totally subject to the Sabbatical restrictions.]

C. *Said to him Abbaye, “[Your] final clause creates no problem, for it imposes a stringency. [B treats the citron as tithed in accordance with when it blossomed. This creates a stringency, insofar as it renders the citron subject to all of the Sabbatical restrictions.] But [your] first clause [at A surely creates a problem, for it states], ‘It is exempt from removal.’ Why [is this the case]?”*

D. *[Rabbah can respond: The reason is that] we say, “Follow blossoming as the deciding factor [in determining to what year the citron belongs].” [Since the blossom appeared in the sixth year, the fruit is not subject to the Sabbatical restriction of removal.]*

E. *[Abbaye can reply to Rabbah:] If this is the case [that we determine the citron’s year by when the tree blossomed, in A’s case, contrary to what you say] it should be subject to tithes!*

F. *[Rabbah] said to him, “Everyone handles it during the Sabbatical year, yet you say it should be subject to tithes!” [Even though these citrons, growing in the fields during the Sabbatical year, are not Sabbatical produce and in fact remain the private possession of the field’s owners, people treat them like Sabbatical food, available for everyone’s consumption. As a result, these citrons are deemed in the category of abandoned property, which, like Sabbatical produce, is exempt from tithes.]*

- G. But Rav Hamnuna said, “[A citron that blossomed] in the sixth year [of the Sabbatical cycle] that continued growing in the Sabbatical year in all regards is treated as produce of the sixth year.

H. “[And a citron that blossomed] in the Sabbatical year that continued growing in the eighth year in all regards is treated as produce of the Sabbatical year.”

- I. *They objected:* R. Simeon b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, “A citron [that blossomed] in the sixth year [of the Sabbatical cycle] that continued growing in the Sabbatical year is exempt from tithing and is exempt from removal, for nothing exists that is subject to tithes that did not grow in [a period of] liability and was not picked in [a period of] liability. [The citrons referred to here are exempt, since the Sabbatical year is not a period of liability to tithes.] And a citron [that blossomed] in the Sabbatical year that continued growing in the eighth year is exempt from tithing and [also] is exempt to removal, for nothing exists that is subject to removal that did not grow in the Sabbatical year and get picked in the Sabbatical year. [The citrons referred to here are exempt, since they were picked after the Sabbatical year.]
- J. *The first part [of Simeon’s statement] contradicts the position of Rav Hamnuna. [Simeon states that a citron that blossoms in the sixth year and continues growing in the seventh is exempt from tithing. This is contrary to Hamnuna, who says that such fruit is treated in all ways as produce of the sixth year and therefore is subject to tithes.] And the concluding part [of Simeon’s statement,] contradicts both the position of Rabbah and that of Rav Hamnuna. [Simeon holds that a citron that blossoms in the Sabbatical year and continues growing in the eighth year is exempt from removal. Both Rabbah and Hamnuna hold that, like Sabbatical produce, this citron is subject to removal.]*
- K. *There is [a dispute among] Tannaite authorities [regarding whether, to determine if the citron is subject to the Sabbatical restrictions, we follow the point of blossoming or picking]. For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. **Sheb. 4:21**]: Said R. Yosé, “Abtolemos testified in the name of five elders that a citron is subject to [the separation of] tithes [required] in the year in which it is picked. But in Usha, our rabbis voted and ruled [that its liability] both for tithing and [in regard to the restrictions of] the Sabbatical year follows the point at which it is picked.”*
- L. *[Reference is made to] the Sabbatical year. Why is this brought up?*
- M. **[15b]** *[You can understand the reference to the Sabbatical year by proposing that the statement] is defective. Now, here is how [the statement at D-E] should be taught on Tannaite authority: **A citron is subject to [the separation of] tithes [required] in the year in which it is picked** and is subject to [the restrictions of] the Sabbatical year according to when it blossomed. [The appended statement accounts for Rabbah and Hamnuna’s view, that a citron that blossoms in the Sabbatical year but is picked in the eighth year is subject to removal. Rashi: Unlike Rabbah, however, Hamnuna reads Abtolemos’s view to hold that, while for tithes, picking is decisive, a citron picked in the Sabbatical year is exempt, since people treat it as common property.] **But in Usha, our rabbis voted and ruled [that its***

liability] both for tithing and [in regard to the restrictions of] the Sabbatical year follows the point at which it is picked.

**X.8** A. *It is taught on Amoraic authority: R. Yohanan and Resh Laqish, the two of them, say, “A citron of the sixth year that continued growing in the Sabbatical year in all regards [is treated as produce of the] sixth year.”*

B. [Elaborating on A] when Rabin came [from the land of Israel] he said: “R. Yohanan [says], ‘A citron of the sixth year that continued growing in the Sabbatical year—even though [at the end of the sixth year it was only so big] as an olive and [in the Sabbatical year] it became as big as a loaf—[it is treated as produce of the sixth year, such that, by eating it without tithing, people] are guilty [for violating the restrictions against eating] untithed produce.’”

**X.9** A. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. A tree the fruit of which blossomed prior to the fifteenth of Shevat is tithed according to [the rules for] the prior year [in which it blossomed]. [This is the case even though it is picked in the new year, after the fifteenth of Shevat.] [A tree that blossomed] after the fifteenth of Shevat is tithed according to [the rules for] the coming year, [that is, again, the year in which it blossomed and, in this case, is picked].

C. Said R. Nehemiah, “In what circumstance does this apply? In the case of a tree that produces two broods a year.”

D. [The following is interjected, explaining the use of the term “brood,” which normally applies to birds.] “Two broods”—*you wonder.... Rather [to make himself clear, Nehemiah] should say, “[Trees that produce fruit] like two broods.”*

E. [Nehemiah continues], “But [in the case of] a tree that produces only one brood, such as dates, olives, and figs, even though the fruit blossomed prior to the fifteenth of Shevat, it is tithed [according to the procedure] for the coming year, [in which the fruit ripens and is picked].” [In the case of such trees, the year for tithing accords with the point at which the produce is picked.]

**X.10** A. Said R. Yohanan, “In respect to the carob tree, the people followed [the law] as set by R. Nehemiah.”

B. *Resh Laqish objected to [this statement of] R. Yohanan [by citing M. Sheb. 5:1: As for] white figs [which appear in the Seventh Year]—their [period of being subject to the restrictions of the] Sabbatical year is the second year [of the new Sabbatical cycle], because they take three years to ripen fully.* [This indicates that, contrary to Nehemiah’s view, even fruit that ripens all at once is tithed according to the year in which the blossoms appeared, not when it is picked.]

C. *[Unable to respond, Yohanan] was silent.*

D. *Said R. Abba the priest to R. Yosé the priest, “Why was he silent? He should have responded, ‘[Your refutation is irrelevant, since] I have told you [the view of] R. Nehemiah, while you have replied [with the view of the anonymous] rabbis, [who stand behind M. Sheb. 5:1].’”*

- E. *[Resh Laqish] would have said to him, “Have you rejected [the majority view of] the rabbis and followed [the practice of] R. Nehemiah?”*
- F. *Then let him respond, “[Your answer to me is irrelevant since, whereas] I informed you of [the people’s actual] practice, you told [me of] the [legal] prohibition!”*
- G. *[Resh Laqish] would have said to him, “Where a [legal] prohibition exists, [simply] because [the people have a different] practice, do we allow it?”*
- H. *Then let him respond, “[Your answer to me is irrelevant since, whereas] I spoke [only] about [the people’s practice in] tithing carobs, which is a rabbinical [requirement in the first place], you spoke of the laws for the Sabbatical year, which derive from Scripture.”*
- I. *Rather, [with this fact in mind] said R. Abba the priest, “I would be surprised if Resh Laqish responded to this statement [of Yohanan at all]!”*
- J. *[Abba’s comment is odd, for how can he question] whether [or not] Resh Laqish responded to [Yohanan’s] statement. Indeed, [we are told explicitly that] he responded!*
- K. *[To correct the problem] phrase [Abba’s comment as follows: “I would be interested to know] whether [Yohanan did not reply to Resh Laqish’s challenge, because] he accepted [the validity of Resh Laqish’s point] or [because, for the reason given at I] he did not accept [the validity of Resh Laqish’s statement at all and believed it undeserving of a response].”*

## 1:2

- A. [16a] At four seasons of the year the world is judged:**
- B. at Passover through grain;**
- C. at Pentecost through fruit of the tree;**
- D. at the New Year all who enter the world pass before Him like troops,**
- E. since it is said [Psa. 33:15]: “He who fashions the hearts of them and who considers all their works;”**
- F. and on the Festival [of Tabernacles] they are judged through water.**

- I.1.** A. [At M. **R.H. 1:2B**] which “grain” is meant?
- B. *Shall I assume that it is grain that [at Passover] already exists [ready to be harvested, having been sown the preceding fall]? [This is unacceptable since, if reference is to the standing crop, as for] all of those hardships [the grain underwent, which reduced the yield]—when were they suffered? [A poor harvest at the current Passover cannot result from God’s judging of the world at that same time. This crop necessarily reflects an earlier judging of the world.]*
- C. *[Accordingly, M. **R.H. 1:2B** means that, through] grain that will be sown [in the coming fall, God’s judgment, which took place at Passover, is actualized.]*
- D. *[C-D is challenged.] D suggests that only one judgment is passed [that has an impact on grain].*
- E. *But [to the contrary] thus it is taught on Tannaite authority: A calamity or misfortune [that affects the grain] prior to Passover [results from a] judgment from*

the preceding [Passover; if the incident occurs] after Passover, [it results from a] judgment [to be enacted] on the coming Passover. [Accordingly M. **R.H. 1:2B** might refer to grain already growing at Passover. This grain would have been subject to a judgment passed the preceding Passover.] A man who experiences a calamity or misfortune prior to the Day of Atonement [suffers from a] judgment from the preceding [Day of Atonement; if the incident occurred] after the Day of Atonement, [it results from a] judgment [to be enacted] on the coming [Day of Atonement].

- F. *Said Rava, “Learn from this that two judgments apply [to the same produce, one from the preceding year, one from the coming year].”*
- G. *Said Abbaye, “Therefore, if a man sees that a [normally] slow-growing [kind of] seed is doing well [indicating a positive judgment on the preceding Passover], he should go ahead [quickly] and plant fast-growing seed, so that, before the time of the coming judgment, it may get a good start.”*

**I.2 A.** *Which authority [stands behind] the Mishnaic passage [at M. **R.H. 1:2**]?*

- B. *It is neither R. Meir, R. Judah, R. Yosé, nor R. Nathan.*
- C. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. **R.H. 1:13**]: “All are judged on New Year, and the decree is sealed on the Day of Atonement”—the words of R. Meir. [This clearly disagrees with M. **R.H. 1:2**, which speaks of judgment’s taking place at four different points in the year.]*
- D. **R. Judah says, “All are judged on the New Year, and the decree of each and every one of them is sealed in its own time:**
- E. **“at Passover through grain; at Pentecost through fruit of the tree; and on the Festival [of Tabernacles] they are judged through water [M. **R.H. 1:2B-C+F**].** [This too disagrees with M. **R.H. 1:2**, which does not distinguish between the time of judgment and the point at which one’s fate is sealed.]
- F. **“And humans are judged on New Year and their decree is sealed on the Day of Atonement.”**
- G. **R. Yosé says, “Humans are judged every single day, as it says [Job. 7:17-18, ‘What is man that you did make so much of him and did set your mind upon him], did visit him every morning?’”**
- H. *R. Nathan says, “Humans are continually judged, as it says [Job. 7:17-18, ‘What is man, that you did make so much of him, and did set your mind upon him, did visit him every morning], and test him every moment?’” [Yosé and Nathan disagree with M. **R.H. 1:2**’s notion that there are only four times of judgment.]*
- I. *Now, if you say that, in all events, R. Judah [stands behind M. **R.H. 1:2**] and that, when [the Mishnah] speaks of [seasons of judgment it refers to] the final judgment [whereas Judah is giving a separate rule, for intermediate acts of judgment]—in this [interpretation] the [different perspectives of M. **R.H. 1:2** and Judah’s statement, F, regarding the rule for] humans [still poses] a difficulty. [Rashi: M. **R.H. 1:2D** refers only to people’s being judged on New Year, whereas Judah states that their judgment is completed on the Day of Atonement.]*
- K. *Said Rava, “The Tannaite authority [who phrased the Mishnaic passage at M. **R.H. 1:2D**] was of the House of R. Ishmael. For the House of R. Ishmael teaches on Tannaite authority: **At four seasons of the year the world is judged: at***



**Passover through grain; at Pentecost through fruit of the tree; on the Festival [of Tabernacles] they are judged through water [M. R.H. 1:2B-C+F].** And humans are judged on New Year, and their decree is sealed on the Day of Atonement. *Now, when the Mishnah [at M. R.H. 1:2D] speaks [of humanity's being judged at New Year, it refers only to] the beginning of [the act of] judgment."*

- I.3 A.** *Said R. Hisda, "What is the basis in Scripture for [the position of] Yosé [that humans are judged every single day]?"*
- B. *The reason is as is stated [through the citation of Job. 7:17-18]: "What is man that you did make so much of him and did set your mind upon him], did visit him every morning?"*
- C. *[Through the question at A] here is what we meant to ask: Why did Yosé not phrase the Scriptural basis [for his view using the same verse] as R. Nathan [that is, why do they not argue this claim on the basis of the same Scriptural statement?]*
- D. *[In Yosé's view] "testing" [which is referred to in the clause cited by Nathan] only suggests scrutiny!*
- E. *But "visiting," [which is referred to in the clause cited by Yosé] also suggests nothing more than scrutiny!*
- F. *Rather said R. Hisda, "The Scriptural foundation of Yosé's view derives from here [1Ki. 8:59: 'Let these words of mine, with which I have made supplication before the Lord, be near to the Lord our God day and night], to do the judgment of his servant and the judgment of his people Israel, as each day requires."*

**I.4 A.** *And said R. Hisda, "[When] the king and the community [await judgment], the king enters in first for judgment, as it is said [1Ki. 8:59: '...to do] the judgment of his servant [Solomon] and [then] the judgment of his people Israel."*

- B. *What is the reason [that the king is judged first]?*
- C. *If you wish I can argue that it is not proper for the king to remain outside [alone while the people are being judged]. And if you wish I can argue that [the king is judged] before [God has heard the community's sins and] really become angry.*

- I.5 A.** *Said R. Joseph, "Whose authority are we following when, these days, we [daily] pray for the sick and the ailing?"*
- B. *Whose authority? That of R. Yosé, [who, we have seen, holds that judgment occurs every day].*
- C. *But if you wish, I [even] can reason: Indeed, [it is done] according to [the authority of] the rabbis, [M. R.H. 1:2, who hold that people are judged only at New Year].*
- D. *And [in accepting this view of the rabbis, we interpret their statement] according to [the perspective of] R. Isaac. For said R. Isaac, "Crying out [that is, supplication] is good for a person whether it occurs prior to or after the [actual] passing of final judgment." [Remembering the sick in daily prayers, that is, is worthwhile even though judgment already was passed on the preceding New Year.]*

**I.6** A. *It is taught on Tannaite authority* [see T. **R.H. 1:12** and T. **Suk. 3:18**]:

- B. Said R. Judah said R. Aqiba, “Why does the Torah state [that the Israelites must] offer the *omer* at [the time of] Passover? Because Passover is the season of [the harvest of] grain.
- C. “The holy one, blessed be he, said, ‘Offer before me an *omer* at [the time of] Passover so that the grain in the fields might be blessed for you.’
- D. “And why does the Torah state [that the Israelites must] offer two loaves at Pentecost? Because Pentecost is the season for fruit of the tree. [Simon, p. 60: “The connection between the loaves and fruit lies in the fact that firstfruits were not brought to the Temple before Pentecost.”]
- E. “The holy one, blessed be he, said, ‘Offer before me two loaves at Pentecost so that the fruit of the trees might be blessed for you.’
- F. “And why does the Torah state [that the Israelites must] pour out a water libation at the Festival [of Tabernacles]?
- G. “Said the holy one, blessed be he, ‘Pour out a water libation before me at the Festival [of Tabernacles] so that the rains of the year will be blessed for you.’
- H. “[God further said], ‘Also, say before me on New Year [the Scriptural passages concerning] kingship, remembrance, and [the blowing of] the ram’s horn:
  - I. “Kingship—so that you will proclaim me king over you.
  - J. “Remembrance—so that memory of you may rise favorably before me.
  - K. “And through what [will that memory be made to rise]? Through the ram’s horn.”

### **Judgment at the New Year of TISHRÉ**

**I.7** A. Said R. Abbahu, “Why do we blow a ram’s horn?

- B. “Said the holy one, blessed be he, ‘Blow a ram’s horn before me so that I will remember in your favor the binding of Isaac, the son of Abraham, and will credit [that act] to you, as though you bound yourselves [before me, willing to offer yourselves as a sacrifice].”
- C. Now, said R. Isaac, “Why do we sound [the ram’s horn] on New Year?” [The Hebrew verb used here for “sound” refers specifically to the blowing of the sound called “Tekiah.”]
- D. [How can you ask], “Why do we sound it?”
- E. [*This is obvious.*] *The merciful told us to sound it!* [Psa. 81: 3 reads: “Sound the trumpet at the new moon, at the full moon, on our feast day.”]
- F. Rather [Isaac’s question, A, intends to ask], “Why do we blow the Teruah sound?”
- G. [*Again the question appears obvious.*] [*How can you ask*], “*Why do we blow the Teruah sound?*”
- H. [*It is because*] *the merciful said* [Lev. 23:24: “Say to the people of Israel, ‘In the seventh month, on the first day of the month, you shall observe a day of solemn rest], a memorial proclaimed with the blast [*Teruah*] of trumpets.”]

- I. Rather [Isaac's question intends to ask], "Why do they sound the Tekiah and blow the Teruah sitting **[16b]** and [then] sound the Tekiah and blow the Teruah standing?"
  - J. It is to confuse Satan [Simon: "the Accuser"].
- I.8 A.** And R. Isaac said, "[As for] any year at the beginning of which they do not sound the Tekiah—at the end of it evil will occur.
- B. *"What is the reason?"*
  - C. "For they have not confused Satan."
- I.9 A.** And said R. Isaac, "[As for] any year which is poor at the beginning—at its end it becomes rich.
- B. "As it says in Scripture [Deu. 11:12]: 'From the beginning of the year [to the end of the year].'
  - C. "[The phrase 'From the beginning'] is written [without the Hebrew letter *aleph*, so as to spell] 'from poverty.'
  - D. "[The verse then ends], 'To the end'—[this signifies] a conclusion that is a latter end."
- I.10 A.** And said R. Isaac, "A person is judged only on the basis of his actions up to that time, as it is said [Gen. 21:17: 'The angel of God called to Hagar from heaven, and said to her, "What troubles you, Hagar? Fear not], for God has heard the voice of the lad as he is.'"
- I.11 A.** And said R. Isaac, "Three things call to mind a person's iniquities.
- B. "These are they: a shaky wall, testing of prayer, and requesting [divine] judgment upon one's fellow." [By walking by a teetering wall, the individual tempts fate. "Testing prayer" refers to experimenting to see if prayer produces the desired effect. The third item is explained in the following.]
  - C. For said R. Abin, "Whoever requests [divine] judgment on his fellow—he is done [that is, judged] first, as it says [Gen. 16: 5]: 'And Sarai said to Abram, "May the wrong done to me be on you!"' [Sarah thus called for divine judgment of Abraham.]
  - D. "And [proving that, as a result, she herself was judged first] it is written [after that, Gen. 23: 2]: 'And Abraham went in to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her.'"
- I.12 A.** And said R. Isaac, "Four things cancel a person's judgment.
- B. "And these are they: charity, crying out [in supplication], change of name, and change of character.
  - C. "Charity—as it is written [Pro. 10: 2: 'Treasures gained by wickedness do not profit], but righteousness delivers from death.'
  - D. "Crying out [in supplication]—as it is written [Psa. 106: 6]: 'And they cried out to the Lord in their trouble, and he delivered them from their distress.'
  - E. "Change of name—as it is written [Gen. 17:15: 'And God said to Abraham], "As for Sarai your wife, you shall not call her name Sarai, but

Sarah shall be her name.” And [after this statement] it is written [Gen. 17:16]: ‘I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her.’

F. “Change of character—as it is written [Jon. 3:10]: ‘When God saw what they did, [how they turned from their evil way....’ And [after this statement, in the continuation of the verse] it is written: ‘God repented of the evil which he had said he would do to them, and he did not do it].”

G. And some say also [that] changing location [cancels a person’s judgment].

H. For it is written [Gen. 12: 1]: “Now the Lord said to Abram, ‘Go from your country [and your kindred and your father’s house to the land that I will show you].” And it continues [Gen. 12: 2]: “‘And I will make of you a great nation, [and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing].”

I. *But [as for] the other [that is, Isaac, A—why does he not include in his list changing location]?*

J. *[Isaac rejects that Gen. 12: 1-2 proves that changing location alters a person’s fate.] [Isaac holds that, contrary to H’s interpretation] here [in the case of Abraham] the merit of [being in] the land of Israel benefited him. [Abraham’s becoming great was not related to the simple fact that he had changed locations but, rather, to his going in particular to the land of Israel.]*

**I.13** A. And said R. Isaac, “A person is obligated to pay respects to his master [that is, teacher] on [each] festival,

B. “as it says [2Ki. 4:22-23, referring to the story of Elisha and the Shunamite woman: ‘Then she called to her husband and said, “Send me one of the servants and one of the asses, that I may quickly go to the man of God and come back again.” And he said], “Why will you go to him today? It is neither the New Moon nor Sabbath.”’ [As Simon, p. 62, notes, “Sabbath” here is used as a generic term for all holy days.]

C. *“From [this there is an obvious] inference that on the New Moon and Sabbath one should go.”*

**I.14** A And said R. Isaac, “A person is obligated to purify himself on [each] festival,

B. “as it says [Lev. 11:8, referring to swine]: ‘and their carcasses you shall not touch—[they are unclean to you].”’ [The Scriptural foundation of this claim follows.]

C. *That which is taught on Tannaite authority makes the same point—[Lev. 11: 8 states]: “And their carcasses you shall not touch—[they are unclean to you].” Is it logical [to assume] that, [at Lev. 11: 8, ordinary] Israelites are cautioned regarding touching carcasses?*

D. [Indicating that this is not the case] Scripture states [Lev. 21: 1: “And the Lord said to Moses], ‘Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, [and say to them that none of them shall defile himself for the dead among his people].”’

E. The sons of Aaron are cautioned [regarding contact with a corpse]; the people of Israel are not cautioned.

- F. Now, is there not an argument *a minori ad majus*? If in the case of the severe uncleanness [of a human corpse, Lev. 21: 1], priests are cautioned, but Israelites are not cautioned, [then, in the case of] the minimal uncleanness [of an animal carcass, Lev. 11: 8], all the more so [are priests, but not Israelites, cautioned]!
- G. What [then is the meaning of that which] Scripture states [Lev. 11: 8]: “And their carcasses you shall not touch”? [The verse applies] on a festival. [This is as Isaac claimed, A, that, on festivals in particular, Israelites must remain pure.]

**I.15** A. Said R. Kruspedai said R. Yohanan, “Three books are opened [by God] on the New Year: one for the thoroughly wicked, one for the thoroughly righteous, and one for middling [people].

- B. “The thoroughly righteous immediately are inscribed and sealed for [continued] life.
- C. “The thoroughly wicked immediately are inscribed and sealed for death.
- D. “Middling [people] are left hanging from New Year until the Day of Atonement.
- E. “If they [are found to have] merit, they are inscribed for life.
- F. “If they [are found] not [to have] merit, they are inscribed for death.”
- G. *Said R. Abin, “What is the Scriptural [foundation for this]? [Psa. 69:29 states]: ‘Let them be blotted out of the book of the living. Let them not be inscribed among the righteous.’ ‘Let them be blotted out of the book’—this refers to the book of the thoroughly wicked. ‘[... of the] living’—this refers to the book of the righteous. ‘Let them not be inscribed among the righteous’—this refers to the book of middling [people].”*
- H. *Rab Nahman bar Isaac said, “From here [Exo. 32:32, referring to Moses’s entreating of God to forgive the people’s sin: ‘So Moses returned to the Lord and said, “...But now, if you will, forgive their sin]. But if not, blot me, I pray, from your book which you have written.”’ ‘Blot me, I pray’—this refers to the book of the thoroughly wicked. ‘From your book’—this refers to the book of the righteous. ‘Which you have written’—this refers to the book of middling [people].”*

**I.16** A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The House of Shammai say, “[There will be] three groups on the Day of Judgment [when the dead will rise]: one comprised of the thoroughly righteous, one comprised of the thoroughly wicked, and one of middling [people].
- C. “The thoroughly righteous immediately are inscribed and sealed for eternal life.
- D. “The thoroughly wicked immediately are inscribed and sealed for Gehenna,
- E. “as it is written [Dan. 12: 2]: ‘And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to eternal life and some to shame and everlasting contempt.’
- F. “Middling [people] go down to Gehenna **[17a]**, scream [in prayer], and rise [again],
- G. “as it is written [Zec. 13: 9]: ‘And I will put this third into the fire and refine them as one refines silver and test them as gold is tested. They will call on my name, and I will answer them.’

- H. “And, concerning this group, Hannah said [1Sa. 2: 6]: ‘The Lord kills and brings to life. He brings down to Sheol and raises up.’”
- I. [The Hillelites reject the notion that the middling group initially is sent to Gehenna.] The House of Hillel say, “But [contrary to what the Shammaites hold, God] who abounds in mercy leans towards [a judgment of] mercy.
- J. “And concerning them [that is, the middling group] David said [Psa. 116: 1]: ‘I love the Lord, because he has heard my voice [and my supplications].’
- K. “And [further] concerning them David stated the whole passage [which begins, Psa. 116: 6]: ‘The Lord preserves the simple; when I was brought low, he saved me.’”

**I.17 A.** Israelite wrongdoers [who sin] with their body and gentile wrongdoers [who sin] with their body go down to Gehenna and are judged [i.e., punished] there for twelve months.

- B. After twelve months their body is consumed [in fire], their soul is burned, and a wind scatters them under the feet of the righteous.
- C. [This is] as it says [Mal. 4: 3]: “And you shall tread down the wicked, for they will be ashes under the soles of your feet [on the day when I act, says the Lord of hosts].”
- D. But the sectarians, the informers, and heretics, who denied the Torah, who denied the resurrection of the dead, who separated themselves from the ways of the community, who tyrannized the land of the living, and who sinned and caused many others to sin—such as Jeroboam son of Nebat and his associates—[these individuals] go down to Gehenna and are judged there for generations.
- E. [This is] as it says [Isa. 66:24]: “And they shall go forth and look on the dead bodies of the men that have rebelled against me. [For their worm shall not die, their fire shall not be quenched, and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh].”
- F. Gehenna will be consumed [by fire], but they will not be consumed,
- G. as it says [Psa. 49:14]: “And their form shall waste away; Sheol shall be their habitation.”
- H. Now, [as for] all of this—why?
- I. Because they place their hands on the habitation, as it says [Psa. 49:15]: “their habitation.”
- J. And [the term] “habitation” refers only to the Temple sanctuary, as it says [1Ki. 8:13, concerning Solomon’s completion of the Temple]: “I have built you an exalted habitation, [a place for you to dwell for ever].”
- K. And concerning those Hannah said [1Sa. 2:10]: “The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces.”
- L. Said R. Isaac bar Abin, “Now, their faces shall look like the sides of a pot, [that is, black and charred].”
- M. *And said Rava, “And these are the most handsome of the people of Mehoza, and they shall be called, ‘sons of Gehenna.’”*

**I.18 A.** Said a master: the House of Hillel say, “But God who abounds in mercy leans towards [a judgment of] mercy.”



- B. “Now, [suggesting the contrary], thus it is written [Zec. 13: 9, taken to refer to middling people]: ‘And I will put this third into the fire.’”
- C. There [in the Hillelite’s statement we speak of] Israelite wrongdoers [who sin] with their body.
- D. [How can the Hillelites’ statement that God leans towards mercy refer to] Israelite wrongdoers [who sin] with their body? *For, indeed, you have said that they have no remedy [but are doomed].* [After twelve months in Gehenna, such people’s body is consumed in fire, their soul is burned, and a wind scatters them under the feet of the righteous.]
- E. *They have no remedy [only] when their wrongdoings are more numerous [than their good deeds].*
- F. Here [in the Hillelites pronouncement we speak of people who have] an equal number of wrongdoings and merits, but whose wrongdoings include those of Israelite wrongdoers [who sin] with their body. *Their [judgment] will not be fulfilled until [they experience what is described in Zec. 13: 9]: “And I will put this third into the fire.”*
- G. *But if [we speak of people who are] not [in the category of Israelite wrongdoers who sin with their body, they are subject to the principle]: “But God who abounds in mercy leans towards [a judgment of] mercy.” And concerning them said David [Psa. 116: 1]: “I love the Lord, because he has heard [my voice and my supplications].”*
- H. *Rava explained, “What is the meaning of that which is written [Psa. 116: 1]: ‘I love the Lord, because he has heard [my voice and my supplications]’? The community of Israel stated in the presence of the holy one, blessed be he: ‘Master of the world! When am I beloved in your sight? When you hear the voice of my supplication.’ [Psa. 116: 6 states]: “When I was made poor, he saved me.” Even though I am poor in [the observance of] commandments, it pleases God to save me.”*

**I.19 A.** [As for] “wrongdoers of Israel [who sin] with their body”—*who are they?*

- B. *Said R. Qerisqapata, “[Reference is to] a cranium that does not put on a phylactery.”*
- C. [As for] “gentile wrongdoers [who sin] with their body”—*[who are they]?*
- D. Said Rab, “[People who erred] through [sexual] impropriety.”
- E. ...”who tyrannized the land of the living.”
- F. Said Rab Hisda, “This is a leader of the community who spreads fear upon the community other than for the purpose of [forwarding the demands of God in] heaven.”
- G. Said R. Judah said Rab, “Every leader of the community who spreads fear upon the community other than for the purpose of [forwarding the demands of God in] heaven will never have [literally: see] a son who is a disciple of a sage. [We know this to be the case], as it is said [Job. 37:24]:

“Therefore people fear him. He shall not see any who are wise of heart.”

- I.20** A. The House of Hillel say, “But God who abounds in mercy leans towards [a judgment of] mercy.”
- B. *How does God act?*
- C. R. Eleazar says, “He presses down [on the side of the balance-scale representing merit], as it is said [Mic. 7:19]: ‘He will again have compassion upon us. He will push down our iniquities.’”
- D. R. Yosé bar Hanina said, “He lifts [the side of the balance-scale representing wrongdoings], as it is said [Mic. 7:18]: ‘Who is a God like you], raising iniquity and passing over transgression.’”
- E. *It is taught on Tannaite authority in the house of R. Ishmael:* He passes over the first transgression [of each type], and this is [God’s] attribute [of mercy].
- F. Said Rava, “The transgression itself is not erased, *so that, if there [turns out to] be a majority of transgressions, God. considers it with the others.*”

- I.21** A. Rava said, “[As for] anyone who passes over his right [to exact punishment against another], they pass over all of his transgressions,
- B. “as it says [Mic. 7:18]: ‘Who is a God like you], pardoning iniquity and passing over transgression.’
- C. “For whom does God pardon iniquity? For the one who pardons transgression [in others].”
- D. *Rab Huna the son of Rab Joshua was ill. Rab Pappa entered to ask about him. He saw that he was in his final illness. [Pappa therefore] said to those [present], “Prepare a [burial] shroud for him!” In the end [however, Huna] recovered. Rab Pappa was embarrassed to see him.*
- E. *[Pappa] said to him, “[When you were ill] what did you see?”*
- F. *[Huna] said to him, “Indeed, it was as [you thought], but the holy one, blessed be he, said to them [that is, to the heavenly court], ‘Since [Huna] did not [needlessly assert his rights [against others], do not assert [yourselves] against him, ‘as it says [Mic. 7:18]: “Pardoning iniquity and passing over transgression.”’ For whom does God pardon iniquity? For the one who pardons transgression [in others].”*
- G. [We continue with an unrelated analysis of the continuation of Mic. 7:18:] “[Who is a God like you, pardoning iniquity and passing over transgression] for the remnant of his inheritance?”
- H. Said R. Aha bar Hanina, “[This is like] a fat tail that has a thorn in it. [God passes over transgression] ‘for the remnant of his inheritance,’ but not for all [the people] of his inheritance!”
- J. **[17b]** [The verse means that God passes over the transgression of] whoever makes himself as though he were a remnant [by humbling himself and behaving like the righteous (Rashi)].

**I.22** A. *Rab Huna pointed out an [apparent] inconsistency:*

- B. “It is written [Psa. 145:17]: ‘The Lord is just in all his ways.’

- C. “And [in the continuation of the same verse] it is written, ‘and kind in all his doings.’”
- D. [There is no contradiction.] [The point is that] at first [God is] “just” and [then], at the end, [he is] “kind.”

**I.23 A. R. Eleazar pointed out an [apparent] inconsistency:**

- B. “It is written [Psa. 62:12]: ‘And to you, Lord, belongs kindness.’
- C. “And [in the continuation of the same verse] it is written, ‘For you requite a man according to his deeds.’”
- D. [There is no contradiction.] At first—”For you requite a man according to his deeds.” And, at the end—”And to you, Lord, belongs kindness.”

**I.24 A. Ilpi, and some say Ilpa, pointed out an [apparent] inconsistency:**

- B. “It is written [Exo. 34: 6]: ‘and abounding in kindness.’
- C. “And [in the continuation of the same verse] it is written, ‘and truth.’ [How can God be kind and, at the same time, judge a man according to the truth?]
- D. [There is no contradiction.] At first—”and truth.” And, at the end—”and abounding in kindness.”
- E. [We have an unrelated interpretation of the beginning of Exo. 34: 6.] “The Lord passed before him and proclaimed....”
- F. Said R. Yohanan, “Had Scripture not stated this [explicitly] we would not be able to claim it.
- G. “[This verse] teaches that the holy one, blessed be he, wrapped himself [in his prayer shawl] like the representative of the community [who leads the prayer service] and showed Moses the order of the prayers.
- H. “God. said to him, ‘Whenever [the people of] Israel sin, they should perform before me this order [of worship], and I shall forgive them.’”
  - I. “The Lord, the Lord”—[this means]: “I am he before a person sins, and I am he after a person sins and repents.”
  - J. “A God merciful and gracious”—said Rab Judah, “A covenant has been made through the thirteen attributes [enumerated in these verses], such that [the people of Israel] will not return empty handed [upon reciting them].
  - K. “[This is] as it says [Exo. 26:10]: ‘Behold, I make a covenant.’”

**I.25 A. Said R. Yohanan, “Great is [the power of] repentance, which obliterates a person’s final judgment.**

- B. “[This is] as it says [Isa. 6:10]: ‘Make the heart of this people fat and their ears heavy and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their hearts and turn and be healed.’
- C. *Said Rab Pappa to Abbaye, “But perhaps [Isa. 6:10’s notion that, if people ‘turn’ they will be ‘healed,’ applies only] before the final decree [is made]?”* [In this view, contrary to Yohanan, once final judgment has been passed, repentance does not have the power to obliterate that judgment.]
- D. [Abbaye] said to him, “[At Isa. 6:10] ‘and be healed’ is written. Which thing [leads the individual to] require healing? Let us say [it is] the final decree!” [Hence the power of repentance is as Yohanan, A, said.]

- E. *They objected:* “[We know a teaching which states that if a wrongdoer] repented between [New Year and the Day of Atonement, his transgressions] are forgiven. If he did not repent, even if he brought [as sacrifices] all of the rams of Nebayot, he will not be forgiven.” [Accordingly, the efficacy of repentance is restricted to a specific period. Repentance does not have the power Yohanan ascribes to it.]
- F. *There is no contradiction. This [latter statement, at F-G, refers] to an individual. This [former statement refers] to a community.*
- G. *They objected [on the basis of a prior teaching], “Referring to the land of Israel, Deu. 11:12 states]: ‘The eyes of the Lord your God are always upon it’—[which means] sometimes for good and sometimes for evil. ‘Sometimes for good’—how so? Lo, if at New Year [the people of] Israel were [in the category of people who are] thoroughly evil, so that insubstantial rains were decreed for them, but, in the end, they turned [and changed their ways]— [for God] to supply additional rain is impossible, since the judgment already has been decreed. Rather, the holy one, blessed be he, brings down [the rain] at the proper time, upon the land that requires it, entirely according to [the needs of the particular plot of] land. [But the amount of rain, previously decreed, does not change.] ‘Sometimes for evil’—how so? Lo, if at New Year [the people of] Israel were [in the category of people who are] thoroughly righteous, so that substantial rains were decreed for them, but, in the end, they turned [and changed their ways]— [for God] to supply less rain is impossible, since the judgment already has been decreed. Rather, the holy one, blessed be he, brings down [the rain] at the wrong time, upon land that does not require it. [The previously decreed quantity of rain does not change. But the rain is made to fall in areas in which it is wasted.] [If, as Yohanan claims, in response to repentance, the decree will be rescinded], for [the case of individuals who changed their ways to the] good, at least, let the judgment be rescinded so as to increase for them [the quantity of rain]!” [The fact that the quantity of rain is not increased proves that repentance does not have the power Yohanan ascribes to it.]*
- H. *There [in the case of a decree regarding the quantity of rain] it is different, since it is possible to [solve the problem by doing] that . [In this case actually altering the decree is not necessary and therefore is not done. This reflects the special nature of the circumstance, not a limitation of the power of repentance.]*
- I. *Come and learn [a further challenge to Yohanan’s position]:*
- J. [Psa. 107:23-31 states:] “Some went down to the sea in ships, doing business on the great waters. They saw the deeds of the Lord, [his wondrous works in the deep]. For he commanded and raised the stormy wind, which lifted up the waves of the sea. [They mounted up to heaven, they went down to the depths. Their courage melted away in their evil plight]. They reeled and staggered like drunken men [and were at their wits’ end]. Then they cried to the Lord in their trouble, [and he delivered them from their distress. He made the storm be still, and the waves of the sea were hushed. Then they were glad because they had quiet, and he brought them to their desired haven]. Let them thank the Lord for his steadfast love, [for his wonderful works to the sons of men]!” [The psalmist] made them signs corresponding to the “buts” and “onlys” in the Torah, so as to teach you [that if] they cried [in supplication to the Lord] prior to the passing of [their] final

judgment, they were answered. [Reference is to an inverted Hebrew letter (“nun”) that appears in the Masoretic text before a number of the verses of this psalm.] But if they cried [to the Lord] after [their] final judgment was passed, they were not answered. [Accordingly, we see that repentance does not have the unmitigated power Yohanan ascribes to it.]

K. *[The challenge to Yohanan’s understanding of the power of repentance is rejected.] Here too the people are treated as individuals! [We already know that for individuals, repentance is not invariably efficacious. Yohanan’s view applies only to the case of a community. That accordingly does not disprove Yohanan’s theory.]*

L. *Come and learn:*

M. Valeria, the proselyte, questioned Rabban Gamaliel: “It is written in your Torah [at Deu. 10:17: ‘For the Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords...], who does not lift his countenance [and takes no bribe].’

N. “But [by contrast, at Num. 6:26] it is written: ‘May the Lord lift up his countenance upon you, [and give you peace].’” [These passages appear contradictory.]

O. R. Yosé the priest joined her and said, “I will tell you a parable illustrating the matter:

P. “[This is] as in [the case of] a man who lent his associate a *maneh* and, in the presence of the king, established a time [for repayment]. And [the borrower] swore to him on the life of the king [that he would repay the loan].

Q. “The time came, and he did not repay it. He [therefore] went to make peace with the king.

R. “But [the king] said to him, ‘For the insult done to me, I forgive you. Go and make peace with your associate [who lent you the money].’

S. “So too [is the distinction between the verses quoted at B and C]:

T. “Here [at Num. 6:26, which refers to God’s lifting his countenance in forgiveness, reference is] to transgressions that are between a person and the omnipresent.

U. “But. here [at Deu. 10:17, which states that God does not lift his countenance in forgiveness, reference is] to transgression that are between one person and another.”

V. [This explanation was accepted] until R. Aqiba came and taught: **[18a]** “This [at Num. 6:26, which refers to God’s lifting his countenance in forgiveness, applies] prior to the passing of the final judgment.

W. “But. this [at Deu. 10:17, which states that God does not lift his countenance in forgiveness, applies] after the passing of the final judgment.”

X. *Here too we are dealing with an individual! [For individuals, repentance is efficacious only up to the point of the final judgment. But in the case of a community that repents, God will forgive at any time.]*

**I.26 A.** Now, [the rule for] the final judgment of an individual [is under dispute by] Tannaite authorities. For it is taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. R. Meir used to say, “[As for] two men who took to bed with the same illness,
- C. “and so [in the case of] two men who ascended the scaffold to be punished for the same offense—
- D. “this one leaves [bed alive], while this [other] one does not leave [the bed alive],
- E. “this one escapes [death], while this [other] one does not escape [death].
- F. “Why did this one leave [bed alive], while this [other] one did not leave [the bed alive], this one escape [death], while this [other] one did not escape [death]?
- G. “[In each case] this one [who was saved] prayed and [his prayer] was answered, while this [other] one [who was not saved] prayed, but [his prayer] was not answered.
- H. “Why was this one answered while this [other] one was not answered?
- I. “This one offered a sincere prayer and [therefore] was answered, while this [other] one did not offer a sincere prayer and [therefore] was not answered.”
- J. [Disagreeing] R. Eleazar said, “Here [in the case of the individual who was saved] it was prior to the passing of the final judgment; here [in the case of the individual who was not saved] it was after the passing of the final judgment.”
- K. [Agreeing with Meir], R. Isaac said “Crying out [that is, supplication] is good for a person whether it occurs prior to or after the [actual] passing of final judgment.” [See above, unit V.E.]

**I.27** A. [The Talmud now examines the larger question of God’s handling of the final judgment of a community.] *Now, can the final judgment of a community indeed be revoked [whether before or after passing of the final judgment]?*

- B. Now, [suggesting the contrary], thus it is written in one text [Jer. 4:14]: “Jerusalem, wash your heart from wickedness, [that you may be saved];”
- C. While [in a different place] it is written [Jer. 2:22]: “‘Though you wash yourself with lye and use much soap, the stain of your guilt is still before me,’ [says the Lord God].”
- D. *Indeed, does this [verse, cited at B] not pertain prior to passing of the final judgment, while this [verse, cited at C] applies after the passing of the final judgment? [If this is the case, then the same rule applies to communal and personal repentance.]*
- E. *[Rejecting D’s explanation:] No! Both [statements] apply after passing of the final judgment.*
- F. *But [even so] there is no contradiction:*
- G. This [verse, cited at C, which denies the efficacy of supplication] pertains to a final judgment accompanied by an oath, while this [verse, cited at B, which assumes that repentance works] applies to a final judgment that is not accompanied by an oath.
- H. *This accords with [the view of] Rab Samuel bar Imi, for said Rab Samuel bar Imi, and some say [it should read:] said Rab Samuel bar Nahmani said R. Yohanan, “From what passage in Scripture do we know that a final judgment accompanied by an oath never is revoked?*



- I. “[This is] as it is said [1Sa. 3:14]: ‘Therefore I swear to the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli’s house shall not be expiated by sacrifice or offering for ever.’”
- J. [Rava argues that I does not prove H’s contention that a final judgment accompanied by an oath under no circumstances is revoked.] Said Rava, “[1Sa. 3:14 means nothing more than that] *through sacrifice or offering* [the transgression of the house of Eli] will not be atoned.
- K. “But it will be atoned through [study of] Torah.”
- L. Abbaye said, “Through sacrifice or offering [the transgression of the house of Eli] will not be atoned. But it will be atoned through Torah and acts of loving kindness.”
- M. *Rabbah and Abbaye were of the house of Eli. Rabbah, who engaged in [study of] Torah, lived forty years. Abbaye, who engaged in [study of] Torah and acts of loving kindness, lived sixty years.*

**I.28 A.** [Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: There once was a family in Jerusalem whose [members] would die at the age of eighteen years. They came and informed Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai.

- B. He said to them, “Perhaps you are of the house of Eli?”
- C. “For concerning them it is written [1Sa. 2:33]: ‘And all the increase of your house shall die [as young] men.’
- D. “Go and engage [yourselves in study of] Torah that you might live!”
- E. They went and engaged in [study of] Torah and [as a result] they lived [to old age].
- F. And [thereafter people] referred to this [family] as the family of Rabban Yohanan, after his name.

**I.29 A.** Said R. Samuel bar Inia in the name of Rab, “From what verse in Scripture do we know that the final judgment of a community is never sealed?”

- B. [Samuel’s underlying claim is rejected.] Never sealed?
- C. But [indicating the contrary] thus it is written [Jer. 2:22: “‘Though you wash yourself with lye and use much soap], the stain of your guilt is still before me,’ [says the Lord God].”
- D. [In light of C, to uphold A’s larger point, we must rephrase Samuel’s question as follows:] Rather [how do we know that] even though [the judgment of a community] is sealed], it can be revoked?
- E. For it says [Deu. 4: 7: “For what great nation is there that has a god so near to it] as the Lord our God [is to us], whenever we call upon him?” [The fact that God listens “whenever we call” proves that the community’s judgment is never final.]
- F. But [to the contrary, suggesting that God is not always available] it is written [Isa. 55: 6]: “Seek the Lord while he may be found, [call upon him while he is near].”

G. That [verse] applies to an individual, [whose final judgment, we already know, cannot be changed], while here [at E] reference is to a community.

**I.30** A. As for an individual—when [should he call upon God so as to alter his sentence]?

B. Said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “During the ten days between New Year and the Day of Atonement.”

C. [We have additional evidence for the significance of the ten days between New Year and the Day of Atonement.] [1Sa. 25:38 states]: “And about ten days later the Lord smote Nabal.”

D. Ten days? What is their significance? [That is, why was Nabal allowed ten days before his final judgment was imposed?]

E. Said Rab Judah said Rab, “[The ten days of respite] correspond to the ten meals Nabal gave to David’s servants.” [See 1Sa. 25: 5.]

F. Said Rab Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha, “These were the ten days between New Year and the Day of Atonement.”

**II.1** A. **At the New Year all who enter the world pass before Him like troops [M. R.H. 1:2D].**

B. *What is the meaning of [the term “Benei Maron,” translated here] “like troops”?*

C. *Here [in Babylonia] it was translated “like sheep.”*

D. Resh Laqish said, “[It refers to the fact that people pass before God] as [though they were going through] the pass of Beth Maron.” [Reference apparently is to a narrow pass, through which people would need to walk single-file.]

E. Said Rab Judah said Samuel, “[It refers to the fact that they pass in review] like the troops of the house of David.”

F. Said Rabbah bar Rab Hannah said Yohanan, “[Even though individuals pass by God single file] still, all of them are examined [together], with a single glance.”

G. *Said Rab Nahman bar Isaac, “Indeed we also have learned this on Tannaite authority: [Psa. 33:14-15 reads: ‘From where he sits enthroned he looks out upon all the inhabitants of the earth], he who fashions together the hearts of them all, who observes all their deeds.’ What does this mean? Shall I reason it means that God created everyone on earth and unites their hearts together? But [that is impossible, since] we see that it is not the case. [People on earth are not united.] Rather, does it not mean the following?—The creator sees [into] their hearts together and observes all their deeds.”*

### 1:3

**A. On the occasion of six new moons messengers go forth:**

**B. (1) at Nisan, because of Passover; (2) at Ab, because of the fast; (3) at Elul, because of the New Year; (4) at Tishré, because of the determination of the set feasts; (5) at Kislev, because of Hanukkah; and (6) at Adar, because of Purim.**

**C. And when the Temple stood, they go forth also at Iyyar, because of the lesser Passover [observed by those unclean for the first Passover].**

**I.1.** A. *Now, [messengers] should also go forth at Tamuz [the seventeenth of which is a fast day] and Tebet [the tenth of which is a fast day]!*

- B. **[18b]** *For, [indicating that these months contain fasts, said Rab Hanna bar Biznah said R. Simeon Hasida, “What is the meaning of that which is written [Zech. 8:19]: ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts: “The fast of the fourth month, the fast of the fifth, the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth shall be to the house of Judah [seasons of] joy and gladness [and cheerful feasts].”’”*
- C. *[The following points out an inconsistency in the verse. In context, the point seems to be that, since the referenced days are not always fasts, messengers need not be sent out to announce their month.] God called them “fasts,” and he called them “[seasons of] joy and gladness.”*
- D. *[How can they be both fasts and times of joy?] In times of peace they shall be [seasons of] joy and gladness. If there is no peace, [they are] fasts.*
- E. *[Offering a different explanation] said R. Pappa, “This is the meaning: In times of peace they shall be [seasons of] joy and gladness.*
- F. *“If there is [a period of persecution] decreed by the government, [they are] fasts.*
- G. *“If there is not [a period of persecution] decreed by the government but also not peace, those who so desire fast, and those who [do not] wish [to fast] do not fast.”*
- H. *If it is the case [as Pappa states, that the fasts in Tamuz and Tebet are optional], then the [fast of the] ninth of Ab also [should be optional].*
- I. *Said R. Pappa, “The case of the ninth of Ab is different, since many misfortunes occurred on that date. For a master said [M. Ta. 4:6]: On the ninth of Ab [the decree was made against our forefathers that they should not enter the land], the first and the second Temple were destroyed, Betar was taken, and the city was plowed up [after the war of Hadrian].”*

- I.2 A.** Said R. Simeon [b. Yohai], “R. Aqiba expounded four verses, but I do not interpret [them] like him.”
- B. *“[In reference to Zec. 8:19 Aqiba said], “The fast of the fourth [month]”—this is the ninth of Tamuz, on which [the wall of] the city [of Jerusalem] was breached,*
- C. *“as it says [Jer. 52: 5-7: “So the city was besieged until the eleventh year of King Zedekiah.] On the ninth day of the fourth month the famine was so severe in the city that there was no food for the people of the land. Then a breach was made in [the wall of] the city.”*
- D. *“Now, why is it called the fourth? It is the fourth [in the sequence] of months.”*
- E. *[Simeon’s report of Aqiba’s interpretation of Zec. 8:19 continues:] “The fast of the fifth [month]”—this is the ninth of Ab, on which the house of our God was burned.*
- F. *“Now, why is it called the fifth? It is the fifth [in the sequence] of months.”*
- G. *[Simeon’s report of Aqiba’s interpretation of Zec. 8:19 continues:] ““The fast of the seventh [month]”—this is the third of Tishré, on which Gedaliah b. Ahikam was killed. And who killed him? Ishmael b. Netaniah killed him.*
- H. *“[The fact that there is a fast on this day] teaches you that the death of the righteous is given equal weight as the burning of the house of our God.*
- I. *“Now, why is it called the seventh? It is the seventh [in the sequence] of months.”*

- J. [Simeon's report of Aqiba's interpretation of Zec. 8:19 continues:] "The fast of the tenth [month]"—this is the *tenth* of Tebet, on which the king of Babylon laid siege to Jerusalem,
- K. "as it says [Eze. 24: 1-2]: 'The word of the Lord came to me in the ninth year, in the tenth month, on the tenth day of the month: 'Son of man, write down the name of this day, this very day. The king of Babylon has laid siege to Jerusalem this very day.'"
- L. "Now, why is it called the tenth? It is the tenth [in the sequence] of months."
- M. [Simeon now indicates his disagreement with Aqiba:] "But [if the meaning is as Aqiba claims] would it not have been appropriate [at Zec. 8:19] to list [this fast] first, [insofar as it commemorates the event that occurred first]?"
- N. "Why [in Aqiba's interpretation] is it written about here [as the last referenced fast in Zec. 8:19]?"
- O. "In order to place the months in their correct order [even though, chronologically, this makes no sense]."
- P. [Simeon continues:] "But I do not interpret [matters] thus.
- Q. "Rather [in my view] 'the fast of the tenth'—this is the *fifth* of Tebet, on which the news reached the diaspora that the city [of Jerusalem] had fallen,
- R. "as it says [Eze. 33:21]: 'In the twelfth year of our exile, in the tenth month, on the fifth day of the month, a man who had escaped from Jerusalem came to me and said, 'The city has fallen.'"
- S. "And they treated the day of the report as comparable to the day of the actual burning [of the city].
- T. "Now, my interpretation is more likely than his [that is, Aqiba's].
- U. "For I say [that the verse speaks] of the first [misfortune] first and of the last, last.
- V. "But, while he [only] orders them according to the months [in which the fasts occur], I [also] order them according to the events."

**I.3 A.** *It was stated on Amoraic authority: Rab and R. Hanina say, "[As a result of the destruction of the Temple] the Scroll of Fasting has been nullified." [Fasting and mourning no longer are precluded on the days enumerated in the Scroll, which recalls miraculous or joyous days in Israelite history.]*

- B. R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi say, "The Scroll of Fasting has not been nullified."
- C. Rab and R. Hanina say, "[As a result of the destruction of the Temple] the Scroll of Fasting has been nullified"—
- D. This is why they say it, [interpreting the four fast days listed at Zec. 8:19]:
- E. In times of peace they shall be [seasons of] joy and gladness on which fasting is prohibited. If there is no peace, [they are] fasts
- F. *And so here [in the case of the days listed in the Scroll of Fasting].*
- G. R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi say, "The Scroll of Fasting has not been nullified."
- H. *Those [four days listed at Zec. 8:19] are the [only] ones that the Merciful made dependent upon the construction of the Temple.*

*[When the Temple is rebuilt, the days listed by Zecharia will be feasts; until then, they are fast days.] But these [other days listed in the Scroll of Fasting] remain as they were. [They mark special events in Israelite history and, on them, fasting is prohibited.]*

- I. *Objected Rab Kahana [to the view of Rab and Hanina], “Once, in Lod, they enacted a fast on Hanukkah, and [contrary to the rules for a fast day] R. Eliezer went down [there] and bathed, and R. Joshua [who was there] cut his hair. And they said to them [that is, to the residents of the city], “Go and fast [in penitence] for having fasted [on a day listed in the Scroll of Fasting]!” [The two Rabbinic authorities reject the notion that, even after the destruction, a public fast could be held on a day listed in the Scroll of Fasting. Contrary to Rab and Hanina, the Scroll remains in affect.]*
- J. *Said R. Joseph, “The case of Hanukkah is different, since [celebrating it] is a religious obligation.” [The requirement to kindle Hanukkah lights is deemed comparable to religious obligations listed in the Torah. Hanukkah thus differs from the other days listed in the Scroll of Fasting, which are not deemed to be on Scriptural authority. Eliezer and Joshua’s contention that one may not fast on Hanukkah, accordingly cannot be used to argue that, in their view, the Scroll of Fasting remains in affect and that fasting is prohibited on all of the dates it lists. The view of Rab and Hanina stands.]*
- K. *[Abbaye know challenges Joseph’s notion that Hanukkah is in the category of a religious obligation derived from the Torah.] Said to him Abbaye, “[In response to the destruction of the Temple] Hanukkah should be abolished and the religious obligation with it!” [Abbaye holds that Hanukkah is on Rabbinic authority and therefore can be abolished. The fact that Eliezer and Joshua did not allow this to occur proves the point. The Scroll of Fasting remains in affect. Joseph has not proven that the example is irrelevant.]*
- L. *Said R. Joseph, “Hanukkah is different, since the miracle is well known.” [For this reason the prohibition against fasting on Hanukkah cannot be annulled. But, since this same consideration does not apply to the other days listed in the Scroll of Fasting, celebration of those days as feasts remain in affect. The Scroll has not been annulled]*
- M. *[Aha bar Huna provides a different historical occurrence that suggests that the Scroll of Fasting has not been nullified.] Objected Rab Aha bar Huna [to the view of Rab and Hanina that the Scroll of Fasting has been nullified, “The Scroll of Fasting reads], ‘On the third of Tishré the [practice of] mentioning [God’s name] in legal documents was abolished.’*
- N. “For the Syrian government decreed that [the Israelites] could not mention the name of [God in] heaven.
- O. “But when the Hasmonean kingdom grew strong and defeated them [that is, the Syrians], they ordained that [Israelites] should mention the name of heaven even in legal documents.
- P. “And thus [people] would write: ‘In the such-and- such year of [the reign of] Yohanan the high priest of the almighty God....’

- Q. “But when sages heard about this practice, they said, ‘[This must be abolished since], in the future, this one [i.e., the borrower] will repay the debt, and the legal document [recording the loan, containing God’s name] will wind up lying in the garbage heap, [which would be sacrilege].’
- R. “So [sages] annulled [the practice of including God’s name in legal documents], but [in all events] they designated [that day] a feast [on which fasting would be prohibited].
- S. *“Now, if you imagine that they annulled the Scroll of Fasting—[is it feasible that] former [prohibitions against fasting, listed in the Scroll] were annulled, while later [dates on which fasting was to be prohibited] were added?” [This is unreasonable. Accordingly it is clear that, contrary to Rab and Hanina, the Scroll of Fasting has not been nullified. Both prior and later feast days are in affect.]*
- T. *In this case with what [situation] are we dealing?* [The designation of the third of Tishré as a feast occurred] while the Temple stood. [In this view, the stated argument is not probative. The later date on which fasting is prohibited was added while the earlier dates remained in affect. The designation of a new feast while the Temple stood, that is, teaches nothing about whether or not the Scroll of Fasting continued to be in affect after the Temple was destroyed. Aha bar Huna, by contrast, presumably holds that the new day on which fasting is banned was decreed, after the destruction of the Temple. Only in this understanding does G’s argument make sense.]
- U. **[19a]** *But [if we speak of the period while the Temple stood], explain [the designation of the third of Tishré to be a feast, F, as recognizing] that Gedaliah son of Ahikam was killed on that day.*
- V. *Said Rab, “[Its designation as a feast day] was needed only to render forbidden [fasting] on the preceding day. Further, [regarding] the preceding day, you can explain its [designation as a feast] on the grounds that it is the day after the New Moon [on which day, too, fasting would be prohibited].”* [The weight of this is to suggest that, after the destruction, despite the fact that the Scroll of Fasting was nullified and previous feast days canceled, a new day on which fasting is banned might have been declared, so as to prevent fasting on the day before, or after, a biblical feast. The argument thus is shown to be unacceptable. We have no proof that, after the destruction, the Scroll of Fasting remains in affect.]
- W. The New Moon celebration is [derived] from Scripture, and that which [derives] from Scripture requires no extension. *[This is] as it is taught on Tannaite authority:* Those days that are listed in the Scroll of Fasting—[along with] both [the day] before and [the day] after them—are forbidden [for fasting]. [The period during which fasting is prohibited is extended to lessen the likelihood that an individual will fast on the feast day itself.] [But as for] Sabbaths and festival days—these are forbidden [for fasting], but [the days] before and after them are permitted [for fasting]. What factor distinguishes [days listed in the Scroll of Fasting, from Sabbaths and



festivals]? These [festivals and Sabbaths, mentioned at O, derive from] Scripture, and that which [derives] from Scripture requires no extension. [People are cognizant of the significance of these days and therefore do not fast on them, even if they intend to fast on the preceding or following day.] But these [days listed in the Scroll of Fasting derive from] the words of the scribes, and that which [derives] from the words of the scribes requires extension.

- X. *Then explain [the prohibition against fasting on the second of Tishré] as resulting from the fact that it is the day before the day on which Gedaliah son of Ahikam was killed.*
- Y. Said Rab Ashi, “[The killing of] Gedaliah son of Ahikam [is recorded in] tradition [that is, the later prophets], and they deemed [that which derives from] tradition to be comparable to [that which derives from] Scripture, [so as not to require extension].” [Accordingly the designation of the third of Tishré as a feast day was an entirely new occurrence, responding to the lifting of the ban against mentioning God’s name. After the destruction of the Temple, the Scroll of Fasting was not nullified.]
- Z. *Objected Rab Tovi bar Mattenah [to the view of Rab and Hanina that the Scroll of Fasting has been nullified, “[The Scroll of Fasting reads], ‘On the twenty-eighth of that [month, that is, Adar], good news came to the Jews, that they need not separate themselves from [practice of] the law.’ For the government had decreed that they may not involve themselves with [study and practice of] Torah, that they may not circumcise their sons, and that they must profane the Sabbath. What did Judah b. Shammua and his associates do? They went and took council with a certain matron with whom all of the notables of Rome were familiar. She said to them, ‘Tonight, come and cry [to the Roman government] for help!’ That night, they came and cried out: ‘In the eyes of [God in] heaven, are we not your brothers? And are we not all the children of a single father? And are we not all the children of a single mother? How are we different from every other people and language that you enact harsh decrees upon us?’ Now, as a result [the government] annulled those [decrees], and [as for] that same day—they designated it a feast. Now, if you imagine that they annulled the Scroll of Fasting—[is it feasible that] former [prohibitions against fasting, listed in the Scroll] were annulled, while later [dates on which fasting was to be prohibited] were added?” [This cannot be the case. Accordingly it is clear that, contrary to Rab and Hanina the Scroll of Fasting has not been nullified. Both prior and later feast days are in affect.]”*
- AA. *And if you suggest that here too, [as in the case described the incident took place] while the Temple stood, [this would not be acceptable since], in fact, Judah b. Shammua was a student of R. Meir, and R. Meir lived after [the destruction of the Temple]!*
- BB. *[We know that Judah b. Shammua was Meir’s student] as we have taught on Tannaite authority: [As for] a glass*

vessel in which they made holes and into which they [subsequently] poured lead [in order to seal the openings]—said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “Judah b. Shammua declares it unclean in the name of R. Meir. [19b] But sages declare it clean.” [The important point is the proof that Judah b. Shammua lived later than Meir, whom he cites. This means that the argument stands. Even after the destruction of the Temple, the Scroll of Fasting remains in affect.]

- I.4 A.** *[The Talmud proposes a new perspective on whether or not, after the destruction of the Temple, the Scroll of Fasting was nullified.] This [issue is disputed by] Tannaite authorities.*
- B. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority: “On those days recorded in the Scroll of Fasting—whether during the period in which the Temple exists or in the period in which the Temple does not exist—[people] are forbidden [from fasting]”—the words of R. Meir.*
- C. *R. Yosé says, “During the period in which the Temple exists, [people] are forbidden [from fasting], since [each listed day is a time of] joy for them.*
- D. *“But when the Temple does not exist, they are permitted [to fast on days listed in the Scroll of Fasting], since it is a time of mourning for them.”*
- E. *There is a decided law which [holds that the restrictions against fasting on days listed in the Scroll of Fasting] have been annulled, and there is a decided law which [states that the restrictions against fasting on days listed in the Scroll of Fasting] have not been annulled. This is a problem, [for one] decided law contradicts the [other] decided law!*
- F. *There is no problem. This [law that the Scroll of Fasting remains in affect] applies in [the case of] Hanukkah and Purim, [on which days fasting is prohibited]. This [law that the Scroll of Fasting has been annulled] applies to all other days [listed in the Scroll, on which fasting now is permitted].*

**II.1 A.** **[On the occasion of six new moons messengers go forth: ...] (3) at Elul, because of the New Year; (4) and at Tishré, because of the determination of the set feasts [M. R.H. 1:3B].**

- B. *Since [messengers] go forth [to announce the new month] of Elul, [as for] Tishré—why do they [need to do this again]?*
- C. *Now, if you say it is lest Elul has been intercalated [through the addition of a thirtieth day, so that, if they do not receive special notification, the Diaspora communities will begin Tishré a day early and celebrate the Day of Atonement and Tabernacles on the wrong dates—this reasoning would be unacceptable].*

For thus said R. Hinena bar Kahana said Rab, “From the time of Ezra and onward, we have not found [a case in which] Elul has been intercalated.”

- D. ... “we have not found [a case in which] Elul has been intercalated] — *this is because, [in all those years, intercalating Elul] was not necessary. But if doing so were necessary, they would intercalate that [month]! [Accordingly, the reason is as introduced: Messengers go out at Elul and again at Tishré lest Elul was intercalated.]*
- E. *But this [that is, intercalating Elul] would spoil New Year, [by causing it to be observed on the wrong day]!*
- F. *It is better that New Year be spoiled [through being celebrated on the wrong day] and that all the other appointed times not be spoiled! [Accordingly the reason suggested—and rejected—is shown to be correct. Messengers go out at Tishré so that, should Elul have been intercalated, the Day of Atonement at Tabernacles can be celebrated on the correct days.] [That also is indicated by that which is taught on Tannaite authority [at M. **R.H. 1:3B** itself, which states: **On the occasion of six new moons messengers go forth: ...] at Tishré, because of the determination of the set feasts.***

G. *Learn from this [that matters are as H states].*

**III.1 A. [On the occasion of six new moons messengers go forth:] ... (5) at Kislev, because of Hanukkah; and (6) at Adar, because of Purim [M. **R.H. 1:3B**].**

- B. *But [the notion that] if the year is intercalated, [messengers] go forth also at Second Adar, because of Purim, is not taught [at M. **R.H. 1:3B**].*
- C. *[The absence of this rule is accounted for by the fact that] the Mishnaic passage does not accord with [the view of] Rabbi [Judah the Patriarch].*
- D. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority [see T. **R.H. 1:14**]: Rabbi says, “If the year has been intercalated, [messengers] go forth also at Second Adar, because of Purim.”*
- E. *Should I reason that the following is the basis of the dispute [between Rabbi, who holds that messengers go forth to announce Second Adar, and the anonymous rule in the Mishnah, explained at B, which holds that they do not]?*
- F. *For the master [that is, the anonymous authority at M. **R.H. 1:3**] reasons that all the religious obligations that apply in Second [Adar] apply [as well] in First [Adar]. [In this view, the correct dating of the days of Second Adar is unimportant, and therefore messengers need not be sent. All pertinent obligations already were observed in First Adar.]*
- G. *But the [other] master [that is, Rabbi,] reasons that all of the religious obligations that apply in Second [Adar] do not apply in First [Adar]. [In this view, what happens in Second Adar really matters. Messengers must be sent to assure that people correctly count the dates of that month.]*
- H. *No. In fact, both [disputants] reason that all of the religious obligations that apply in Second [Adar] do not [also] apply in First [Adar].*
- I. *But [instead] they differ concerning the intercalation of the year.*
- J. *For it is taught on Tannaite authority: How many [days are added in] the intercalation of a year? [Rashi: How long is First Adar?]*
- K. *Thirty days.*

- L. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "A month [that is, twenty-nine days]."
- M. *What is special about [its being thirty days, such that the one who holds that view, assumed to be the anonymous authority at M. R.H. 1:3, does not require messengers to go forth to announce the beginning of Second Adar]?*
- N. *[Since it is thirty days, people naturally] know [on what day First Adar ends and Second Adar begins]! [Therefore, messengers are not necessary.]*
- O. *[If First Adar is] a month [as Simeon b. Gamaliel says, people] also will know [when Second Adar begins, a month always comprising twenty-nine days]!*
- P. *Said R. Pappa, "The one who said [that the intercalated period is] a month [holds that, in adding a month, if] it wants [the court may add] a month [of twenty-nine days, or if] it wants [the court may add] thirty days. [This being the case, in the view of one who says that the intercalated period is a month, the people will not automatically know when Second Adar begins. This explains why, in such a person's view, messengers must be sent.]*

**III.2 A.** R. Joshua b. Levi testified in the name of the holy community of Jerusalem, regarding the two months of Adar, that they sanctify them on the day on which they are intercalated. [Reference is to the thirtieth day of the month, added when the month is intercalated. The point here is that, when either First or Second Adar is intercalated, the thirtieth day is celebrated as the New Moon festival of the coming month.]

B. *This is to say that we treat [the month of Adar] as defective [that is, containing only twenty-nine days, but] we do not treat it as full [that is, containing thirty days]. [This is true insofar as the extra, thirtieth day is treated as the first day of the following month.]*

C. *[This serves] to reject that which Rab Nahman bar Hida explained, [for explained Rab Nahman bar Hida], "Testified R. Simai in the names of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi concerning the two Adars, that if they desired to make them both full, they make [them both full; to make] them both defective, [they make them both defective; to make] one full and one defective, [they likewise do so].*

D. "And this was their practice in the Diaspora."

E. But in the name of our Rabbi, they said, "Always, one is full and the other is defective.

F. "[This applies] unless it becomes known to you [through the arrival of messengers] that the New Moon [of Second Adar] has been set at its proper time, [that is, on the thirtieth day of First Adar]."

**III.3 A.** [Discussion of whether the months of Adar consistently are full or defective continues.] They sent [from the land of Israel] to Mar Uqba [saying], "The [month of] Adar that precedes Nisan always is defective."

B. *Objected Rab Nahman, "[We know that in order to present testimony] of the [beginning] of two months they profane the Sabbath [by traveling beyond the Sabbath limit in order to notify the court of the*

**appearance of the new moon]: for Nisan and for Tishré [M. R.H. 1:4A-B].**

- C. *“If you say, ‘Granted, sometimes [Adar] is full and sometimes it is defective’—for this reason they [would need to] profane [the Sabbath so as to deliver information about the actual sighting of the new moon, needed to establish the beginning of the month].*
- D. **[20a]** *“But if you say that [Adar] is always defective, why would [those who sight the moon need to travel beyond the Sabbath limit to report their finding, which would] profane [the Sabbath]?” [This would be unnecessary insofar as the beginning of the new month has been fixed and is known without the actual sighting.]*
- E. *[Even though the beginning of the new month is fixed, the sighting overrides the Sabbath] because it is a religious obligation to sanctify [the new month] on the basis of an [actual] sighting. [This applies even if the sighting is not strictly necessary. Nahman’s objection therefore is unacceptable. Despite the fact that the messengers may profane the Sabbath, we can accept the claim that the month of Adar before Nisan always is defective.]*
- F. *[A different version of Nahman’s statement follows. In this version, Nahman supports the claim that the month of Adar prior to Nisan always is defective.] There are those who report [Nahman’s statement as follows]: Said Rab Nahman, “[In support of the claim that Adar before Nisan always is defective], we also teach on Tannaite authority [M. R.H. 1:4A-B]: In order to present testimony] of the [beginning] of two months they profane the Sabbath [by traveling beyond the Sabbath limit in order to notify the court of the appearance of the new moon]: for Nisan and for Tishré.*
- G. *“If you say, ‘Granted, [Adar] is always defective’—for this reason they [would need to] profane [the Sabbath], since it is a religious obligation to sanctify [the new month] on the basis of an [actual] sighting.*
- H. *“But, if you say, ‘Sometimes [Adar] is full and sometimes it is defective’—why would [those who sight the moon need to travel beyond the Sabbath limit to report their finding, which would] profane [the Sabbath]?*
- I. *“[Instead of profaning the Sabbath], let us intercalate the month now, [making it a full month, in which the Sabbath is the thirtieth day], and*

*sanctify [the new month] tomorrow, [on the thirty-first day, when messengers can come without profaning the Sabbath]!”*

- J. *In the case in which the thirtieth day [of Adar] falls on the Sabbath, that is exactly what we do. [The month is intercalated and treated as full, something which A does not allow.]*
- K. *Here [in the situation which Nahman says proves that Adar before Nisan always is defective] with what circumstance do we deal?*
- L. *[It is a case] in which the thirty-first day [of the month] falls on the Sabbath. [Since this is the longest the month can be, messengers who report sighting the new moon cannot wait until after the Sabbath.]*
- M. *[And, in this case, we allow the messengers to profane the Sabbath even though we know that the new month must now begin], because it is a religious obligation to sanctify [the new month] on the basis of an [actual] sighting.*
- N. *[We have another objection to the rule that a month of Adar that precedes Nisan always is defective.] Objected Rab Kahana, “When the Temple existed, they profaned [the Sabbath] for all [of the months, not just Nisan and Tishré, as reported in the preceding unit],*
- O. *“because of the [need correctly to] set the sacrifice [for the New Moon].*
- P. *“[We must conclude that] since, in the case of all [the other months, the reason for allowing profanation of the Sabbath was] not because it is a religious obligation to sanctify [the new month] on the basis of an [actual] sighting, so in the case of Nisan and Tishré [the reason for allowing profanation of the Sabbath was] not because it is a religious obligation to sanctify [the new month] on the basis of an [actual] sighting. If you say, “‘Granted, sometimes [Adar] is full and sometimes it is defective’—for this reason they [would need to] profane [the Sabbath so as to deliver information about the actual sighting of the new moon, needed to establish the beginning of the month]. But if you say that [Adar] is*



*always defective, why would [those who sight the moon need to travel beyond the Sabbath limit to report their finding, which would] profane [the Sabbath]?” [This would be unnecessary insofar as the beginning of the new month has been fixed and is known without the actual sighting.]*

*Q. This is a [valid] objection!*

- III.4** A. When Ulla came [from the land of Israel] he said, “They have intercalated Elul.” [Rabbinical authorities added an extra day to Elul to prevent a festival in Tishré from falling on a Sunday, consecutively with the Sabbath.]
- B. *Said Ulla, “Do the Associates in Babylonia know what a good thing we [in the land of Israel] have done for them?”*
- C. *What is the good thing?*
- D. *Ulla said, “It is because of vegetables.” [Vegetables required for a Sabbath-festival sequence must be picked on Friday. By the time they are to be consumed on the festival, they are undesirable. By preventing a Sabbath-festival sequence, the authorities of the land of Israel assured that people could have freshly picked food for holiday consumption.]*
- E. *[Offering a different explanation of the advantage of intercalating Elul] R. Aha bar Hanina said, “It is because of the [unburied] dead.” [In the case of a Sabbath-festival sequence, a corpse that is unburied at the onset of the Sabbath cannot be buried until the conclusion of the festival. Preventing a Sabbath-festival sequence assures that a corpse not remain unburied for more than the period of the Sabbath or festival alone.]*
- F. *What is the practical difference between these [two different understandings of the advantage of intercalating Elul to prevent a Sabbath-festival sequence during Tishré]?*
- G. *The practical difference between them is [apparent in the case of] a Day of Atonement that, [were Elul not intercalated, would] fall immediately after the Sabbath.*
- H. *[In such a case] the one [that is, Aha bar Hanina] who says [that we intercalate Elul] on account of the [unburied] dead [would hold that] we [go ahead and] intercalate [so that the dead on remain unburied for two days]. But [in the circumstance described by Ulla] who says [that we intercalate Elul] on account of vegetables—[we must ask]: For when do we need [the vegetables]? For the evening [after the conclusion of the fast on the Day of Atonement]. [This being the case, in Ulla’s reasoning, in this instance, Elul should not be intercalated, since] in the evening one can take the trouble to bring [fresh vegetables].*
- I. *But [even] in the view of the one [that is, Ulla] who states that [Elul is intercalated] on account of [the desire to make available fresh] vegetables, [in an instance such as is described] let them intercalate [it anyway], on account of [the need to bury] the dead!*

- J. *The practical difference between them is [apparent in the case of] a festival that falls consecutively with the Sabbath, whether falling [immediately] before or after it.*
- K. *[In this instance] the one [that is, Ulla] who says [that we intercalate Elul] on account of vegetables holds that we should intercalate Elul on account of vegetables. But [in the view of] the one [that is, Aha bar Hanina] who says [that we intercalate Elul] on account of the [unburied] dead—[Elul should not be intercalated, since] it is possible for [other] peoples [that is, non-Jews, to see to the corpse].*
- L. *But [even] in the view of the one [that is, Aha bar Hanina] who states that [Elul is intercalated] on account of [the need to bury] the dead, [in an instance such as is described] let them intercalate [it anyway], on account of [the desire to make available fresh] vegetables! [We find that in no case can Aha bar Hanina concede that the need for fresh vegetables is a reason to intercalate Elul and prevent a Sabbath-festival sequence from occurring.] Vegetables can be [improved] by [being placed in] warm water.*
- M. *[The result of the preceding is to identify two distinct advantages to intercalating Elul to prevent a Sabbath-festival sequence from occurring, so that the dead need not remain unburied (Aha b. Hanina) or so that fresh vegetables are available (Ulla). We turn now to a secondary question raised by B.] If this is the case [that the reasons is as Ulla and Aha indicate] why [is the intercalation of Elul a] particularly [good thing] for us [in Babylonia]? Even for you [in the land of Israel it should be seen as advantageous]!*
- N. *[Distinguish between the situation in the land of Israel and in Babylonia as follows:] As for us [in the land of Israel], the world is oppressively [hot, so that keeping vegetables or corpses over the Sabbath-festival sequence is a serious concern]. As for them [in Babylonia], the world is not oppressively [hot, so that keeping vegetables or corpses over the Sabbath-festival sequence is not a concern at all].*
- O. *[The preceding unit assumes that a month can be intercalated so as to prevent the occurrence of a Sabbath-festival sequence.] Is this [really] so?*
- P. *But [to the contrary] so taught Rabbah bar Samuel on Tannaite authority: Is it logical that, just as the year is intercalated [through the addition of an extra month] because of a special need [other than that of keeping the calendar in adjustment], so a month may be intercalated because of a special need? [Indicating that we do not do this] Scripture states [Exo. 12: 2, referring to the month of the Exodus]: ‘This month shall be for you the beginning of months.’ [The meaning of the verse is that, when you] see [a moon that appears] like ‘this’ [one, referred to in the verse], you must sanctify it..” [In this view, there is no lee-way to allow taking into account human needs.]*

- Q. Said Rava, *“There is no contradiction. This [passage refers] to intercalating the month, [while] this one [refers to] sanctifying it, and here is the larger point: Is it logical that, just as they intercalate the year and the month out of a special need, so they sanctify a month according to a special need? [To show that this is not the case] Scripture states [Exo. 12: 2]: ‘This month shall be for you the beginning of months,’ [meaning: when you] see [a moon that appears] like ‘this’ [one, referred to in the verse], you must sanctify it.” And this accords with that which R. Joshua b. Levi said: ‘They intimidate the witnesses [to withhold the fact that they saw] a new moon that appeared in its [normal time, on the thirtieth day], so that [the month] may be intercalated. But they do not intimidate the witnesses [into reporting that they saw] a new moon that [in fact] did not appear in its [normal] time, so that [the month may be] sanctified [on the thirtieth when, in fact, it should be intercalated].’”*
- R. *Is this really so? But [indicating the contrary] R. Judah the Prince sent to R. Ami [saying]: “Know that during all of the days of R. Yohanan, he would teach us [that] they intimidate witnesses [into reporting that they saw] a new moon that [in fact] did not appear in its [normal] time, so that [the month may be] sanctified [on the thirtieth instead of being intercalated]. Even though they did not see it, they may say, ‘We saw it.’”*
- S. *Said Abbaye, “There is no contradiction [between the rule attributed to Yohanan and that phrased by Joshua b. Levi]. This [rule of Yohanan, which states that the month may be sanctified early] applies in the case of Nisan and Tishré. This [other rule, which precludes sanctifying the month early] applies to all other months.”*
- V. *Rava said, “That which Rabbah bar Samuel taught on Tannaite authority, [ that intercalation of the year or month never takes into account special circumstances] accords with [the view cited in the name of] ‘Others.’ For it is taught on Tannaite authority [T. Ar. 1:11]: **Others say, ‘There is between one occurrence of Pentecost and another or between one New Year and another [an interval of] four [days of the week] or, if the year was intercalated, five [days].’**” [“Others” hold that full and defective months occur in strict rotation. The year accordingly has 354 days, that is, 50 full weeks and four days, and Pentecost always falls on the sixth of Sivan. An intercalated month has 29 days, that is, four weeks and a day, yielding a five day difference in the day of the week on which the holiday falls.]*

**III.5 A.** *Rab Dimi of Nehardea taught the opposite on Tannaite authority: “They intimidate witnesses [into*

reporting that they saw] a new moon that [in fact] did not appear in its [normal] time, so that [the month may be] sanctified [on the thirtieth instead of being intercalated]. They do not intimidate the witnesses [to cause them to withhold the fact that they saw] a new moon that appeared in its [normal time, on the thirtieth day], so that [the month] may be intercalated. *What is the reason [for this view]?* **[20b]** *In this instance [in which the witnesses are forced not to report what they saw], the lie would be apparent, [since other people can report that they saw the new moon]. But in this instance [in which the witnesses are forced to report what they did not see], the lie would not be apparent, [since it could not be proven that they did not see it (Rashi)].*”

## Calculating the New Moon through Sightings and Otherwise

### A Topical Composite

The allusion in the foregoing to calculating the calendar through the testimony of witnesses to the sighting of the new moon accounts for the insertion of the following, sizable composite on the general theme of new moon sightings.

- III.6** A. *Said Samuel, “I am able to set [the calendar] for [use by] the entire diaspora.”* [Rashi: Samuel knew the stages of the moon well enough to determine the lengths of the months without use of witnesses.]
- B. *Said Abba, the father of R. Simlai, to Samuel, “Does the master know [the meaning of] this [following] statement, which is taught on Tannaite authority in [the document known as] ‘The Secret of Intercalation’?”*
- C. *“‘[What is the implication of whether the new moon] is born before midday or after midday?’”*
- D. [Samuel] said to him, “No.”
- E. *[Abba] said to him [that is, Samuel], “Since the master [that is, you] does not know this, there must [also] be other things that the master do not know!”*
- E. *When R. Zira went [to the land of Israel] he sent back to them [in Babylonia this explanation of the question cited at C: “[In order to proclaim the new moon on the thirtieth of the month] there must be a full night and day of the new moon, [without any appearance of the old moon].*
- F. *“And that which Abba, the father of R. Simlai, said [means]: They calculate [the new moon’s] birth.*
- G. *“If it was born prior to midday, it is known that it will appear close to sunset.*
- H. *“If it was not born before midday, it is known that it will not appear close to sunset.”*
- I. *What is the practical application of this [fact]?*

- J. *Said R. Ashi, "[It can be used] to rebut the witnesses [who claim to have seen the new moon at a point at which it could not yet have appeared]."*

**III.7** A. *Said R. Zira said Rab Nahman, "[At the time of the new moon] the moon is covered [and invisible] for twenty four hours. In our situation [in Babylonia] six [of these hours are attributable] to the old moon and eighteen [are attributable] to the new [moon]. [Rashi: This means that, in Babylonia, the moon cannot be seen until eighteen hours after its birth.] In your situation [in the land of Israel], six [of these hours are attributable] to the [new [moon]] and eighteen [are attributable] to the old moon." [Rashi: This means that, in the land of Israel, the moon can be seen six hours after its birth.]*

B. *What is the practical application of this [fact]?*

- C. *Said R. Ashi, "[It can be used] to rebut the witnesses [who claim to have seen the new moon at a point at which it could not yet have appeared]."*

**III.8** A. *Said a master: "[In order to proclaim the new moon on the thirtieth of the month] there must be a full night and day of the new moon, [without any appearance of the old moon]."*

B. *From what verse do we know this? [At issue is why the period of invisibility of the old moon must begin in the evening.]*

C. *R. Yohanan said, "[Referring to the Day of Atonement, Lev. 23:32 states]: 'from evening to evening....'" [We thus know that festivals run from evening to evening.]*

D. *Resh Laqish said, "[Exo. 12:18 states: 'In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at evening, you shall eat unleavened bread] until the twenty-first day of the month at evening.'" [We see from this verse too that festivals run from evening to evening.]*

E. *What is the practical difference between these [two different understandings of the Scriptural proof for A]?*

F. *Abbayye said, "The meaning [attributed to the verse] by those who interpret distinguishes them." [That is, there is no practical difference at all.]*

G. *[Disagreeing] Rava said, "[Their view of the status of the hours up to] midnight distinguishes them." [Rashi: Yohanan holds that for purposes of the moon, as for the Day of Atonement, "night" begins in the evening. This means that, if the old moon was seen early in the evening, the next day cannot begin the new month. Resh Laqish, by contrast, holds that for purposes of setting the new moon, "night" commences with midnight, just as for the requirement to eat unleavened bread on Passover. In this view, even if the old moon is visible in the hours before midnight, the next day can begin the new month.]*

**III.9** .A] *[On how to determine the calendar in the diaspora when no direct evidence is available regarding the actual appearance of the new moon in the land of Israel:] Said R. Zira said Rab Nahman, " In every case of doubt [for which we retroactively determine to intercalate a month by adding a day we throw it forward [that is, make the following day the added one].*

- B. *“This is to say that [in the case of Passover and Tabernacles] we observe the fifteenth and the sixteenth [as the festivals]. We do not observe the fourteenth [as the festival].”*  
 [Simon, citing Rashi, explains: “I.e., that we reckon fifteen days from the thirtieth day, and also from the thirty-first day of the precious Adar or Elul, out of doubt, but in no case from the twenty-ninth. This dictum would seem to be superfluous, as in no circumstances was New Moon proclaimed on the twenty-ninth day of the preceding New Moon.”]
- C. *But should we not also observe the fourteenth [as part of the festival], lest both Ab and Elul were made short [months, of only twenty-nine days]?*  
 [Simon: “And in this case, what we suppose to have been the twenty-ninth day of Adar or of Elul would really have been the first of Nisan or Tishré.”]
- D. **[21a]** *[C is not the case, since] two [consecutive] short months have a voice [that is, are generally known, so that no special action need be taken].*  
 [Simon, citing Rashi: “Tebeth and Tammuz are always, according to the principles of fixed calendar, defective, and if Shebat which follows Tebeth, Ab and Tammuz were also to be defective, it would have become known to the Diaspora before the advent of the festivals.”]
- III.10.A)** *[We refer to a case in which, in Babylonia, it was not known that, in the land of Israel, the preceding month had been intercalated through the addition of a day.] Levi reached Babylonia on [what the people in Babylonia held to be] the eleventh of Tishré.*
- B. *He said, “How tasty is the food of the Babylonians on that which, in the West, is the great day [of the fast of the Day of Atonement]!”*
- C. *[The people] said to him, “Testify [that today in fact is the tenth, and then we will observe it too as the Day of Atonement]!”*
- D. *He said to them, “[I cannot give testimony, since] I did not hear directly from the court [the statement], ‘It is sanctified [as the new moon].’”*
- III.11 A.** Decreed R. Yohanan: *“In any place to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Nisan can arrive [prior to Passover], but to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Tishré cannot arrive [in time for Tabernacles], you must [in all events] observe two days [both of Passover and Tabernacles]. [In the case of Tishré, because of New Year and the Day of Atonement, the messengers lose three travel days and hence do not get as far as they do when the travel to announce Nisan.] [The inclusion of Passover as a two day observance in] Nisan is a preventative measure because of Tishré. [That is, if people observed the initial festival of Passover for only one day, they might, by analogy, come as well to observe Tabernacles for only a single day.]*
- III.12 A.** *[A specific case is reviewed involving the rule of the preceding unit.] R. Aibo bar Nagri and R. Hiyya bar Abba reached a certain place to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Nisan can arrive [prior to Passover], but to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Tishré cannot arrive [in time for Tabernacles].*



- B. *Now [even though the residents] observed only a single day [of the initial festival of Passover, the Rabbinical authorities] didn't say a word to them [about their wrong practice].*
- C. *R. Yohanan heard [about this] and became angry. He said to them, "Did I not tell you [that] in any place to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Nisan can arrive [prior to Passover], but to which messengers [announcing the new month] of Tishré cannot arrive [in time for Tabernacles], people must [in all events] observe two days [of Passover], as a preventative measure because of Tishré?" [No response is given.]*

**III.13** A. *Rava normally sat and fasted two days [on the Day of Atonement]. [This was because he would not know whether or not, in Jerusalem, the preceding month, Elul, had been intercalated through the addition of a thirtieth day. Hence he treated both the tenth and eleventh of Tishré as the Day of Atonement.]*

- B. *On one occasion [things] were found to be in accord with his [practice]. [That is, it turned out that Elul had been intercalated. Rava's additional fast had fallen on the actual Day of Atonement.]*
- C. *[The theme of the preceding unit continues.] [Once] Rab Nahman sat fasting for the entire Day of Atonement.*
- D. *In the evening [when he was ready to conclude the fast] a certain man arrived from the West [that is, the land of Israel] and said to him, "Tomorrow is the Great Day [that is, the Day of Atonement] in the West!"*
- E. *[Nahman] said to him, "Where are you from?"*
- F. *[The man] said to him, "From Damharia."*
- G. *[Nahman] said to him, "Blood will be his [that is, your] destiny." [This is a play on words, with the letters of this phrase spelling "Damharia." Rashi: Nahman's means that the man will be responsible for his death, insofar as his arrival means that Nahman will have to continue fasting for a second day.]*
- H. *[Nahman] invoked on himself [the verse, Lam. 4:19]: "Our pursuers were swifter [than the vultures in the heavens]."*

**III.14** A. *Rab Huna bar Abin sent to Raba [saying], "When you see that the cycle of Tebet continues until the sixteenth of Nisan, intercalate that year and don't scruple about doing so,*

- B. *"as it is written [Deu. 16: 1]: 'Observe the month [hodesh] of Abib.'*
- C. *"[This means]: Observe Abib of the cycle [that is, the day on which the vernal equinox begins] so that it falls in the new part [hodesh] of Nisan."*

**III.15** A. *Said Rab Nahman to those going out to sea, "[As for] you who do not know how to fix [the beginning of] the month—when you see the moonlight completing [its appearance] by day, remove the leaven [in your possession, to prepare for Passover]."*

- C. *When does the [moonlight] complete [its appearance by day]?*
- D. *On the fifteenth [of the month].*
- E. *[Nahman's system accordingly seems unworkable, since] we must remove the leaven on the fourteenth!*

- F. *Since [out at sea] the [whole] world is revealed to them, [they can see the moonlight] complete [its appearance by day even] on the fourteenth.*

## 1:4

- A. [21b] [In order to present testimony] of the [beginning] of two months they profane the Sabbath [by traveling beyond the Sabbath limit in order to notify the court of the appearance of the new moon]:
- B. for Nisan and for Tishré.
- C. For on these occasions the messengers go forth to Syria.
- D. And on them they determine the set feasts.
- E. And when the Temple stood, they profane the Sabbath [by traveling beyond the Sabbath limit in order to notify the court of the appearance of the new moon] on the occasion of all of the [months],
- F. because of the [need] to determine [the correct day for] the offering [marking the beginning of the new month].
- I.1** A. *[The issue here concerns whether or not messengers only are sent for the same two months for which witnesses may profane the Sabbath.] [In order to present testimony] of the [beginning] of two months [they profane the Sabbath; M. R.H. 1:4A]—*
- B. *But [is it really the case that for] more [months than these messengers do] not [go forth]? Now, [the following statement, M. R.H. 1:3A] contrasts with that [notion]: On the occasion of six new moons messengers go forth....*
- C. *Said Abbaye, “This is what is meant [by M. R.H. 1:3A and 1:4A]: For all [the other months] messengers go forth while it is still evening [on the thirty-first day, since it is certain that the court will proclaim this the New Moon]. But in the case of Nisan and Tishré, [the messengers wait] until they hear directly from the court, ‘It is sanctified.’” [This might occur at anytime during the following day.]*
- D. *That which is taught on Tannaite authority makes the same point For all [the other months] messengers go forth while it is still evening. But in the case of Nisan and Tishré, [the messengers wait] until they hear directly from the court, ‘It is sanctified.’*
- I.2** A. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: From what [verse do we know] that [only in order to present testimony of the beginning] of these [two months] may they profane the Sabbath?*
- B. *Scripture states [Lev. 23:4]: “These are the appointed feasts of the Lord, [the holy convocations], which you shall proclaim at the time appointed for them.”*
- C. *Is it logical that, just as they profane [the Sabbath on their account] up to the point at which they are sanctified, so they may profane [the Sabbath on their account] until they are declared [through notification of the people in the diaspora]?*
- D. *Scripture states: “which you shall proclaim”—this means that, in order to proclaim them you [that is, witnesses who saw the new moon] may profane [the Sabbath];*
- E. *but you may not profane [the Sabbath] in order to declare them [to the communities in the diaspora].*

**II.1 A.** And when the Temple stood, they profane the Sabbath [by traveling beyond the Sabbath limit in order to notify the court of the appearance of the new moon] on the occasion of all of the [months], because of the [need] to determine [the correct day for] the offering [marking the beginning of the new month; M. R.H. 1:4E-F].

- B. *Our Rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:* At first they would profane [the Sabbath] on account of all of them.
- C. Once the Temple was destroyed, Rabban Yohanan b. Zakkai said to them, “Now, is their an offering [that needs to be brought, for which we must have immediate knowledge of the new moon]?”
- D. They ordained that they would not profane [the Sabbath] except for Nisan and Tishré alone.

**1:5**

- A. **Whether [the new moon] appeared clearly or did not appear clearly,**
- B. **they violate the [prohibitions of] the Sabbath on its account.**
- C. **R. Yosé says, “If it appeared clearly, they do not violate the prohibitions of the Sabbath on its account.”**

**1:6**

- A. **M'SH S: More than forty pairs [of witnesses] passed [on their way to Jerusalem].**
- B. **But R. Aqiba kept them back at Lud.**
- C. **Rabban Gamaliel sent to him [saying], “If you keep back the people, you will turn out to make them err in the future.”**

**I.1.** A. *How do we know that [the word] Alil [translated at M. R.H. 1:5A as “clearly” in fact] means “clearly”?*

- B. Said R. Abbahu, “Scripture states [Psa. 12: 6]: ‘The promises of the Lord are promises that are pure, silver refined in clear view [*Alil*] on the ground, purified seven times.’”

**I.2** A. *Rab and Samuel [disagreed regarding the meaning of the following texts]:*

- B. One of them said, “Fifty gates of understanding were created in the world, and all of them were given to Moses, except for one,
- C. “as it says [Psa. 8: 5]: ‘Yet you have made him little less than God.’
- D. “[And Qoh. 12:10 reads]: ‘The Preacher sought to find pleasing words.’
- E. “[This means that] the Preacher sought to be like Moses.
- F. “A heavenly voice went out and said to him [citing Qoh. 12:10]: ‘And uprightly he wrote words of truth.’
- G. “[But regarding Moses it says, Deu. 34:10]: ‘And since then, there has not arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses.’” [We see that, however he might have tried, Solomon (“the Preacher”) could not become comparable to Moses.]
- H. But the other says, “[Deu. 34:10 means that] among the prophets there has not arisen [another prophet like Moses].
- I. “But among the kings there has arisen [another individual such as Moses].

- J. “Rather, how do I explain [Qoh. 12:10, cited to prove that Solomon did not succeed at achieving the level of Moses’s knowledge]: ‘The Preacher sought to find pleasing words’?”
- K. “[This means that] the preacher wished to pass judgments from his heart, that is, without [relying upon] witnesses or [requiring there to have been] prior warning [as a pre-condition without which punishment would not be imposed].
- L. “[As a result of this] a heavenly voice went out and said to him [citing Qoh. 12:10]: ‘And uprightly he wrote words of truth.’ [To ‘write words of truth’ you must follow Deu. 19:15, which states]: ‘Only on the evidence of two witnesses, [or of three witnesses, shall a charge be sustained].’”

**II.1 A. [22a] M<sup>c</sup>SH S: More than forty pairs [of witnesses] passed [on their way to Jerusalem]. But R. Aqiba kept them back at Lud... [M. R.H. 1:6A-B].**

- B. *It is taught on Tannaite authority:* Said R. Judah, “Heaven forbid that R. Aqiba kept them back.
- C. “Rather, Shazpar, head of Geder, kept them back.
- D. “And Rabban Gamaliel sent, and they removed him from his [position of] greatness.”

**1:7**

- A. **A father and his son who saw the new moon should go [to give testimony].**
- B. **It is not that they join together with one another [to provide adequate testimony],**
- C. **but so that, if one of them should turn out to be invalid [as a witness], the other may join with someone else [to make up the requisite number of witnesses].**
- D. **R. Simeon says, “A father and his son, and all relatives, are valid to give testimony about the new moon.”**
- E. **Said R. Yosé, “M<sup>c</sup>SH B: Tobiah, the physician, saw the new moon in Jerusalem—he, his son, and his freed slave.**
- F. **“And the priests accepted him and his son [as witnesses to the new moon], but they invalidated the testimony of his slave.**
- G. **“But when they came before the court, they accepted his [testimony] and that of his slave, but they invalidated that of his son.”**

**I.1 A. Said R. Levi, “What is the basis in Scripture for [the view of] R. Simeon, [M. R.H. 1:7D]?”**

- B. “It is as it is written [Exo. 12: 1-2]: ‘The Lord said to Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, “This month shall be for you [the beginning of months].’”
- C. “[This implies that] this testimony [regarding the sighting of the new moon] shall be valid [when given] by you, [even though you are relatives].”
- D. *But the Rabbis [that is, the anonymous authorities at M. R.H. 1:7A-C, who disallow testimony from close relatives—how do they interpret Exo. 12: 1-2]?*
- E. [They hold it implies only that] this testimony [regarding the sighting of the new moon] shall be give to you. [The authorities of M. R.H. 1:7A-C interpret Exo. 12: 1-2 to mean only that communal leaders are to receive testimony

regarding the sighting of the new moon. But, contrary to Simeon, they do not hold that the verse teaches anything regarding accepting testimony from close relatives.]

- II.1 A.** Said R. Yosé, “**M’SH B: Tobiah, the physician, [saw the new moon in Jerusalem—he, his son, and his freed slave; M. R.Y. 1:7E].**
- B. *Said Rab Hanan bar Rava, “The decided law accords with [the position of] R. Simeon, [M. R.H. 1:7D, which accepts testimony of relatives].”*
- C. *Said Rab Huna to Rab Hanan bar Rava, “[We know the view of] R. Yosé and the actual incident [he reports, M. R.H. 1:7E-G, which reports that the court rejected the testimony of close relatives], yet you say that the decided law accords with [the position of] R. Simeon!” [That clearly is not the case.]*
- D. *[Hanan bar Rava] said to him, “But many times I stated in the presence of Rab [that] the decided law accords with [the position of] R. Simeon, and he didn’t say a word to me!”*
- E. *[Huna] said to him, “[In Rab’s presence] how did you recite the Tannaite statement [reporting the statements of Simeon and Yosé, M. R.H. 1:7D+E-G]?”*
- F. *[In reciting the Mishnaic passage, Hanan bar Rava] said to him the reverse [of how M. R.H. 1:7D+E-G reads]. [Hanan placed the name of Yosé at M. R.H. 1:7D, accepting the testimony of relatives, and cited that of Simeon with M. R.H. 1:7E-G, the incident that shows that the court rejected the testimony of relatives.]*
- G. *[Huna] said to him “[Only] for this reason [that you reported the tradition incorrectly] did Rab not [discern your mistake and] say a word to [correct] your [view that the decided law accords with the view of Simeon].”*
- H. *[We have an independent statement of the authoritative position at M. R.H. 1:7.] Said Tabi the son of Mari Tabi said Mar Uqba said Samuel, “The decided law accords with [the position of] R. Simeon, [M. R.H. 1:7D, which accepts testimony of relatives].”*

### 1:8

- A. **These are the ones who are invalid [to testify about the appearance of the new moon]:**
- B. **(1) he who plays with dice, (2) they who lend on interest, (3) they who race pigeons, (4) they who trade in produce of the Seventh Year, (5) and slaves.**
- C. **This is the governing principle: Any evidence that a woman is not valid [to offer], also they are not valid [to offer].**

- I.1. A.** Thus any evidence that a woman is valid [to offer], also they are valid [to offer].
- B. *Said Rab Ashi, “This is to say that a person who, by their [that is, Rabbinical] standards, is a robber [and hence in the same category as the first four individuals listed at M. R.H. 1:8B] is valid to offer testimony [normally allowed] of a woman.”*

### 1:9

- A. **He who saw the new moon but cannot go [on his own to testify]—they bring him along on an ass, even in a palanquin.**
- B. **And if there is an ambush set up against them, they take staves in hand.**

- C. And if it was a long trip, they take food in hand.
- D. For: On account of a journey [requiring travel] for a night and a day they violate [the prohibitions of] the Sabbath and go forth to give testimony about the new moon, since it is said [Lev. 23: 4]: “These are the set feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which you shall proclaim in their appointed season.”