

HUC Cincinnati thesis of Henry Fisher, 1903

Note: Faded pencil notes are on several opposing pages of the bound thesis. Each of these pages has been scanned and is inserted into the document before the page to which the notes refer. The notes are often hard to read, and it is suggested that the reader zoom in to better interpret the pencil writing.

26
—
51

TRACTATE TAANITH

A TRANSLATION OF THE FIRST TWENTY FOLIO PAGES.

A GRADUATION THESIS.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

1903.

mic. 8/78

TO THE MEMORY
OF
MY TEACHER
DR. MOSES MIELZINER.

PREFACE.

To write an introduction to any treatise of the Talmud implies two things on the part of the writer: a knowledge of the Talmudic literature in general and of the particular treatise under consideration. The writer of the present work certainly would not claim this broader knowledge, nor can he even claim complete familiarity with the one treatise in question.

He aimed to translate the entire tractate of Taanith, but he aimed to accomplish more than he knew. Laboring amid various difficulties and under limitations easily intelligible, the writer realized, after wading through the text of the first chapter, that the completion of the work was beyond his accomplishment, at least within the narrow time-limit set. So he has felt the need of limiting himself to the consideration of twenty folio pages. He cannot but feel regret at his inability to finish the tractate, but he hopes to have covered sufficient of the material to give him a fair insight into, and understanding of the spirit of the treatise.

He has made a beginning: he hopes some day to complete the work so imperfectly begun. The thoughts that he would set down in his introduction, and the illustrations, are necessarily based upon the text, only in so far as it was covered. In his translation the writer has embodied in the text, as much of the commentary of Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac (Raschi) as would lead to a clearer conception of the material.

II.

In the transliteration of proper names, an attempt was made at consistency, by using as an authority, Jastrow's Dictionary, as far as possible. As regards the translation of technical terms, the writer feels conscious that here too, the result obtained is far from that desired. Whatever lack of consistency there may be in these things, is in great part, due to the fact that the first portions of his manuscript had to be given into the hands of the stenographer, before the latter parts were even written.

Amid all the untoward circumstances, the writer has tried to do the best he could. Whatever the results may show, he feels that the many hours spent on this translation, have not been spent in vain. Chief among the benefits derived is one which, it must be confessed, was scarce anticipated, a real interest and genuine pleasure in the work.

Since this thesis marks almost the closing incident of his career at the Hebrew Union College, the writer seeks this opportunity to register his gratitude to each member of its Faculty, for the uniform courtesy and consideration that he has received from the very beginning.

He would also give expression to a word of gratitude to Miss Elsie Semon, a friend, who has so happily succeeded, by dint of conscientious and painstaking effort, in making of this work, a thing most pleasing to the eye.

One word more. In spite of its crudities and its imperfections, the writer ^Sdesigns, in accord with the unanimous action of his class-

mates, to dedicate this work to the memory of his late teacher in Talmud. Whatever merit may be found in these pages, is in great part, due to the kindly efforts of this lovable old man, who has lately gone to his eternal home. *זכר צדיק לברכה*, May the memory of Dr. Moses Mielziner be for a blessing.

Henry M. Fisher

Cincinnati, Ohio, April, 1, 1903

INTRODUCTION.

The tractate to which is given the name Taanith, is in both Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, the eighth treatise or Masechtha of Seder Moed, the second of the six Talmudic divisions. It takes its name from the subject matter of which it treats, the public fasts. So diverse, however, is the material of this treatise, that one must peruse almost a third of the text, before there is even a single mention of fasting (folio 10a).

These public fasts are instituted as memorials of dire calamities in the nation's history, for example: the ninth of Ab, which commemorated the destruction of the Temple, and several other unhappy events. Or they were also observed at the time of almost any distress which befell the community. If there came plague, pestilence, war, famine, locusts, beasts of prey—for any of these a public fast was decreed. But the affliction that was greater than all these was drought. Palestine was an agricultural country, it imported little; it was therefore dependent upon its own resources for sustenance. Rain was absolutely essential to life, the lack of rain was therefore regarded the greatest curse imaginable.

It may safely be asserted that there is far more said in this treatise regarding rain and every varied detail connected with it, than of fasting. The mention of rain, the prayer for it, its importance (folio 7a-8a) the wind, the dew, the clouds, the snow, the nature of rain and its source, the question as to whether it is withheld or not, and if so,

why; all these matters and others are fully and freely treated, especially in the first chapter. Tis not strange, therefore, that drought should be regarded as the primary cause for the institution of communal fasts.

But not alone does this treatise speak of public fasts; it also makes frequent allusion to the fasts of individuals. Sickness or any other trial is considered cause for fasting—in fact, the best antidote for any unfortunate event, even a bad dream, is a fast (folio 12b). So with a succession of causes—fasting is regarded as a means perhaps equal with prayer in efficacy in obtaining Divine favor.

This much is so far established; this tractate treats of fasting in general, and, since rain is of such vital consequence to the community, especially of fasting for lack of it. Having come to a final conclusion as to the respective times for the mention of, and prayer for rain in the service, the Tanna next proceeds to consider what shall be done if rain has not come by a certain date (the seventeenth of Marchesvan) (folio 10 a). First the individuals fast and if they are unanswered, a series of thirteen fasts is decreed, three sets of three, three and seven fasts respectively. During these a general air of seriousness pervades the community and this becomes more and more pronounced with each series of fasts. As to the proceedings (folio 12 b) on these public fast days, it is said, that the morning is devoted to an examination of the judicial affairs of the community, the first half of the afternoon, to readings from the Law and the Prophets and the last quarter of the day to prayer. The question of bathing on a

fast day is considered at great length, as is that of the different number of benedictions in the various sets of fasts.

The second chapter gives a complete account of the public prayer-meeting (folio 15 a), the participants and the service, the additional benedictions and the varying formulae in the Temple-service. The number of requirements for the leader of prayer is especially interesting. Mention is also made of the duties of the various priestly divisions and families in the Temple-service. There are lengthy arguments on the basis of a statement in Megillath Taanith, a book euphemistically named, containing a list of holidays on which one is not permitted to fast or hold a lamentation. There are likewise lengthy arguments as to whether the priest is permitted to shave and drink wine or not.

The third chapter gives the various causes for which the alarm is sounded (folio 19 a) on a week-day and the Sabbath. The nature of these causes is explained and elaborated upon.

What has been said as to the content of Taanith is but the barest outline based essentially on the Mishna. If this were all, the treatise could certainly claim for itself a systematic, orderly, logical development. But the legal parts of this tractate are not the more important parts, for one can find on almost every page of Taanith a large number of illustrations of the Midrashic style of the Rabbis. Sometimes with very little logical basis this material interrupts the Halacha and one may read page after page, the greater part of which is devoted to an exposition of Rabbinical exegesis. One after the

other, the various explanations of the Biblical verses are brought together, the basis of the sequence being sometimes as fantastic as the interpretation itself. But besides the mere fanciful explanation of the Bible verses, Taanith offers in abundance illustration of another kind of material, a part of the Midrash known as Haggada. Under this latter title may be subsumed legends, parables, anecdotes, tales, allegories. They are on every theme and of every sort, usually of an ethical content, and given with the purpose of teaching a moral.

To illustrate in any degree the Halachic material of Taanith is beyond the scope of this introduction. If one would but turn to the text (folio 12a, 13 a, 17 b), he will perhaps understand something of the method of the Rabbis in argument. The Bible is the great authority, and every verse though obviously in contradiction with some other verse must be so explained that the contradiction disappears. (folio 9b). In some cases, the argument is met by counter-argument, one authority met by another, former opinions are bolstered up by further references, everything within the broad knowledge and ingenuity of the disputants, is brought into the discussion to support the one side and weaken the other (folio 11a, 13b, 14a, 18a-b).

The Thora is the authority of all authorities. Inferences are sometimes drawn from some verse in the Pentateuch in a most ingenious way. To find a hint in the Thora means much to a Rabbi in argument and he will make strenuous effort to do so. A fair illustration is found in the argument as to when ^{one} begins to say the formula for the mention of rain. In certain verses in Numbers, ch. 29, regarding the li-

you mean 11' 7 1/2"

bations of the different days of the Feast of Booths, it is claimed that there are three superfluous letters; these make up the word signifying water and from this it is inferred that a hint is given in the Thora (folio 2b), as to the water-libation.

One thing more before leaving the purely Halachic material, Analogy plays an important part in the Rabbinic method of argument (folio 2a, 5a, 12b, 20a); one illustration ought to be quoted even though the conclusion reached is very far-fetched. The question is (folio 17a): How do we know that the priest must trim his beard every thirty days? The inference is made as follows: The word (hair) is found both in reference to the priests (Ez. 44:20) and the Nazirites (Num. 6:5). In connection with the verse referring to the Nazirites is the Hebrew word (נ'ח'), the letters of which equal in numerical value the number thirty. Therefore thirty is also applied to the priests and it is concluded that they must ~~shave~~ ^{trim} every thirty days. Not very conclusive, it must be confessed.

But Taanith claims the attention of the student because of its Midrashic material, rather than its pure Halacha. It is in place therefore to consider something of Talmudic exegesis which is so often quite arbitrary. The verses which are interpreted according to their plain meaning need scarcely be considered; a few illustrations of "Derush" or homiletical interpretation will suffice for an understanding of this method also. In Dt. 32:2, ער'פה is taken in the sense of נק'ה and is interpreted: If a scholar is worthy he is as the dew; if unworthy, kill him (folio 7a). In Job 24:19, צ' is taken in the

sense of commanding '118 and 2111n that of 7777 7/7' and is interpreted: Rain does not come down because of failure to give tithes and offerings (folio 7b). In Ecc. 10:18 77777 is taken in the sense of God on basis of Ps. 104:3 and 7/7' in that of 7/7 on the basis of Lev. 27:8; the verse is therefore interpreted: On account of Israel's failure to study the Law, God becomes too poor to send rain (folio 7b). On the basis of Job 36:6, it is inferred that snow on the mountains is as good as five rains (folio 3b); rain comes for one person's need on the basis of the singular (7/7) in Dt. 28:12 support for many because of the plural (777) in Ex. 16:4 (folio 9a).

The juxtaposition of passages (Num. 20:12) is also made the basis for inference (folio 9a) as is the sequence of words in Prov. 8:26 (folio 10a). Other illustrations are Jer. 50:36, Is. 21:14, Is. 55:1 (folio 7a), Job 36:32 (folio 7b), Ecc. 10:10-11, Job 36:32-3, (folio 8a), Num. 20:29 where 7 is used in one of its four senses (when, perhaps, but, because), Gen. 32:11 (folio 20b). A host of additional references might be quoted but enough has been given to give some insight into the method of the Rabbis.

They sometimes permit themselves to manipulate the text in order to obtain the desired meaning. The changes are seldom very great, being usually based upon a full or defective writing of a word. The following examples will illustrate these changes: in Dt. 8:9 for 77777 (its stones) is substituted 77777 (its builders) (folio 4a); in Ecc. 8:1, for 77777 (will be lessened), is read 77777 (is hated) (folio 7b); in Num. 20:29, for 77777 (And they saw) is read 77777 (And they feared)

(folio 9a).

It must be confessed that these explanations are not always to be taken seriously, especially when we find the statement of one of the Rabbis, that the patriarch Jacob did not die at all. The interpretations are given with a didactic purpose and were never regarded as authoritative.

As to the Haggadic stories, the latter part of Taanith contains more than the first. The tale of the rabbi who gives his blessing to his host, is a tale pure and simple, without any moral (folio 5b). The story connected with R. Joshua and the princess is given to teach that beauty is only skin deep (folio 7a). R. Elazar's vanity is humbled by the incident with a most ugly old man (20b), so that ever after he teaches: A man should ever be as yielding as the reed, but never as unbending as the cedar. The two mystic tales of Choni, the circle-drawer (19a), and Nakdimon ben Goryon (19b), both show that God answers the prayer of the righteous. The story of Choni seems almost childish; in the Nakdimon story there is a far more serious tone. Both are evidently bits of ancient folk-lore.

Besides what has already been mentioned, the treatise offers much of almost every kind of material. The Rabbis are fond of making hypotheses as to the etymology and definition of various terms. Taanith offers not a few illustrations of this sort, for example: ערפילא (4a), רר' and שולקא (6a), שולא and רב עיה (6b), ש'ס'ח and ח'ר'ח (9b), ח'ר'ח (10a). The definition of dozing (12b) is especially interesting.

The Rabbis are certainly not without humor. Of a play upon words there is at least once instance (9a). The last three words of Mal 3:10 are: *וְלֹא יָאָרָץ* (until it is more than enough), which are interpreted to mean: Until you grow weary of saying enough. Sarcasm too is found (12 b). When Rab Shesheth was told that certain Rabbis wore their sandals on a public fast-day, he became angry and said: Perhaps they eat too. When Ula came to Babylon, he saw dates very cheap and yet the people did not study the Law. After eating them and suffering from the effects, he said: A basket-ful of knives for a zuz and yet the people study the Law.

As advanced as the Rabbis were in many things, they were not free from superstition. They were after all, children of their day. For instance, R. Isaac says: If one mentions the word Rachab, he becomes polluted (5b). Again, one may read the incident of a mother snatching her child from under the gaze of R. Jochanan, fearing lest the latter's glance might prove fatal (9a). Says one of the Rabbis: A big step diminishes the eye-sight by one five-hundredth part (10b); says another: Fasting counteracts the possible effects of a bad dream (12b). In another passage it is said: A man's merit is a safe-guard in the hour of danger, but to expose one's self to danger is to lessen one's merit (20b). What grosser superstition than the statement that the demons bring a certain disease upon those who eat before washing.

*This can
not be
called
superstition*

As for Palestine, there is the greatest reverence for it on the part of the Rabbis. It is the first to receive the rain; whatever is left is given to other lands (9b). Jerusalem too is the beloved city.

It will be restored to Israel eventually; she is like a woman whose husband is only gone from her temporarily (20a). So strong an influence did the Temple exert upon the Jews, that it was maintained that from the time of its destruction, the rains came down irregularly (19b).

As regards rain, the Rabbis certainly knew something of the science of meteorology. The various kinds of clouds and winds, the effect of each sort, their nature and significance, all these are discussed at great length (8b). The question as to the source of rain, whether it comes from the waters of the ocean or whether it descends from heaven, is argued pro and con, but always on the basis of the Biblical verses (9b).

Of other sciences the treatise makes but little mention. The knowledge which the Rabbis had as to the geography of the world is rather crude. Egypt is four hundred parasangs square; Chsh is sixty times larger, then sixty times larger is the universe. In the same rate of increase is the Garden, Parādisē and Gehinnom (10a).

Medicine too offers some little data. R. Jochanan says: One should not speak while eating, for fear of choking (5b). It is also said: One should not eat too much while traveling for fear of ill-effects (10b). Again it is taught: A walk or a little sleep counteracts the effects of a little wine; but these only aggravate the situation if one has drunk much (17b). It is also said that the human body becomes swollen from hunger (19b).

From these few data, we may draw little in the way of conclusion definitely. But in the field of theology there are naturally

references of a more definite character. Idolatry is the cardinal sin which alone leads to Gehinnom. All things come from God as gifts; life, rain(8b), resurrection (2a). He is the master of the universe; he is just (11a), faithful (8b), ready to answer the prayer of the pious ones (20a). There is a future life, for in the hour of death, every man is judged strictly according to his deeds; though Grhinnom is mentioned, its meaning is not defined.

A few words as to conduct. The value of study is especially emphasized throughout. No praise is too great for the worthy scholar; all sorts of blessings will come upon him, but woe unto him who is indifferent to the Thora. Observance of the Sabbath is also a great obligation. It is said that rain on Friday is as bad as the Day of Judgment, for it interferes with Sabbath preparations (8b). One of the great merits of Rab Huna was his action in consideration of the Sabbath (20b). Besides, throughout the treatise, one may find numerous remissions of rigors in honor of the seventh day.

The ethical tone is most high. Right-conduct is an ideal. Humility is regarded as a cardinal virtue (15a, 20b). Wickedness, such as slander, theft and impudence bring on the worst of all punishments, drought. Affliction is sure to follow in the train of wrong-doing (8a). And when affliction comes, it is the duty of every man to share in the public distress, he must not separate himself at such a time (11a).

If man has done wrong, mere confession means nothing; he must make restitution (16a). And he must do this at any cost. It is said: If a man has stolen a beam and built it into a castle, he must tear

down the building, if need be, to return what has been wrongfully acquired.

There is scarce a trace of pessimism here. Though the tractate is filled with calamities and sorrows and persecutions, the general tone is optimistic. The spirit is that suggested by the Midrashic interpretation of Is. 64:4—"He who bears the burdens cheerfully—through them the world is helped." (8a).

In conclusion it may be interesting to mention the reasons which a pious rabbi gives for his length of days (20b). This may serve as a type of the pious man. "I never became angry in my house; I never proceeded ahead of one more learned than myself; I never studied in filthy alleys; I never went four paces without thinking of the Law or without the phylacteries; I never dozed or fell sound asleep in the academy; I never rejoiced at the misfortune of another; I never called any one by his by-name."

7012

CHAPTER I.

Mishna: From what time does one begin to mention God's power over the rain. (כַּשֵּׁם הַרוּחַ וְהַמָּטָר יֵצֵא בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי "He who causes the wind to blow and the rain to descend")? R. Eliezer says: From the first day of the Feast of Booths; R. Joshua says: From the last day of this festival. Then said R. Joshua to R. Eliezer: Since rain during the Feast of Booths is only a sign of a curse, why should one mention it (the rain during the festival). To this R. Eliezer answered: I myself did not say that one should pray (תֵּן טֶהֱמָה וּמָטָר "Give dew and rain") for rain during the festival, but only that one should mention the formula: "He who causes the wind to blow and the rain to descend" in order that rain might come in its proper time.

Thereupon R. Joshua answered: If what you say is so, then one ought to mention the rain during the entire year (why should one cease on Passover?)

One should not pray for rain until the season for rain draws near. R. Judah says: He who is the last to pass before the ark (in the שְׁמִינִי additional prayer) on the last day of the Feast of Booths mentions the rain (כַּשֵּׁם הַרוּחַ וְהַמָּטָר יֵצֵא בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי), the first does not (in the שְׁמִינִי morning prayer). On the first day of the Feast of Passover, the first to pass before the ark does mention the rain, the last does not.

Gemara: What does the Tanna assume when he asks: From what time on etc? (He assumes that one does mention God's power over the rain.)

first!
second!

He refers to the passage in Berachoth which teaches: One mentions God's power over the rain in the Resurrection of the Dead (second of the "Eighteen Benedictions") and one prays for rain in the Blessing of the Years(ninth of the "Eighteen Benedictions") and one mentions the Haddala (prayer at the conclusion of Sabbath) in the Blessing of Understanding (fourth of the "Eighteen Benedictions").

Therefore having assumed that one does mention God's power over the rain, the Tanna teaches: From what time does one mention etc. But why does he not teach the time also there (in Berachoth which is in the second division of the Mishna); why does he put it off to this point (to Taanith which is in the fourth division of the Mishna)? The Tana has in mind the passage in Rosh Hashana (Which is in the same division of the Mishna as Taanith). This passage teaches: "And on the Feast of Booths, God passes judgment regarding the rain "

While he teaches: "And on the Feast of Booths, God passes judgment regarding the rain, he teaches also: From what time one begins to mention etc.

But the Tanna ought to teach: From what time does one make mention of rain; why does the Mishna have the expression: power of rain? R. Jochanan says: Because the rains come down ^{by the (of God)} with power, for it is written (Job 5:9): "He doth great things which are unsearchable, wonders without number", and it is also written (Job 5:10): "He it is who gives rain to the earth's surface and sends water upon the surface of the streets."

How do these verses prove it?

A just while reciting the 18 Benedictions (תפלה)?

מן does not mean life but a ^{contin} woman in
the hour when she gives birth to a child.
In this hour God himself helps her, not
through a man.

What does R. Jochanan teach us? Rabba bar Shila said: We make an analogy by means of the word חקר in this passage and in another passage referring to the creation of the world. It is written here (Job 5:9). "He doth great things which are unsearchable " (חקר) and it is written also (Isaiah 40:28), " Dost thou not know? hast thou not heard? God is the Eternal, Creator of the ends of the earth; he does not grow weary nor faint, unsearchable (חקר) is his understanding." Furthermore it is written (Ps. 65:7): " He establishes the mountains with his strength, he is girded with power בגבורה". (Since גבורה occurs in connection with the creation of the world where the word חקר also occurs, so likewise is חקר to be understood in regard to the rain where we also find the word חקר.)

Whence do we know that one should pray for rain? It is taught in a Baraitha: (Dt. 11:13) "To love the Lord, your God and to serve him with all your heart. What is service with the heart? Surely it must be prayer and in the following verse (Dt. 11:14), we read: "And I will give rain to your land in its season, the early rain and the late rain." (Hence by the sequence of passages, we infer that one should pray for rain *in the rain*).

R. Jochanan said: Three keys are in the hand of God *of rain* and are not entrusted to any messenger; these are: the key of rain, the key of life and the key of the resurrection of the dead. The key of rain, for it is written (Dt. 28:12): "The Lord will open (פתח) his good treasure-house for you to give rain to thy land in its season." The key of

life, what Biblical basis have we for this? It is written (Gen. 30:22): "And God remembered Rachel and he hearkened unto her (folio 2b) and opened (לפתח) her womb." The key of the resurrection of the dead, what Biblical basis is there for this? It is written (Ez. 37:13): "And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I open (לפתח) your graves." In the West they include also the key of sustenance, for it is written (Ps. 145:16): " Thou openest (לפתח) thy hand and satisfiest the desire of every living creature." And why does R. Jochanan not include this key? He thinks rain and sustenance are the same.

Mishna: R. Eliezer says: From the first day of the Feast of Booths; R. Joshua says: From the last day of this festival.

The following question came up before the Rabbis: Whence does R. Eliezer derive this? Does he draw his conclusion from the Lulab (the festive wreath of the four combined species used on the Feast of Booths) or from the Water-libation (the Water-libation on the seven days of the Feast of Booths)? If he draws his conclusion from the Lulab, then as the Lulab comes in the day-time (of the first day), so should the mention begin in the day-time. But perhaps he draws his conclusion from the Water-libation, in which case, as the Water-libation begins on the first evening—for it has been said that as "their meal-offerings and their libations" (Num. 29:18) are even in the evening—so also should the mention begin on the first evening.

Come and hear. R. Abbahu says: R. Eliezer only drew his conclusion from the Lulab. Some say R. Abbahu has this from tradition and others

on Passover: 720721 420 9577

say a Baraitha was his authority. What is this Baraitha? It is taught: From what time does one mention rain? R. Eliezer says: From the time of the taking up of the Lulab (the first day); R. Joshua says: From the time when it is put away (the seventh day).

R. Eliezer ~~might~~ have said in support of his opinion: the four species (which make up the Lulab wreath) are only for the purpose of entreating God in the matter of rain, for just as these four species cannot exist without water, so the world cannot exist without water. But R. Joshua (might then have) said to R. Eliezer: Is not rain on the Feast of Booths a sign of God's ill-favor? To this R. Eliezer (could have) answered: I myself did not say that one should pray for rain, but merely mention it, for just as one mentions the resurrection of the dead the whole year, although it can occur only at a fixed time, so might one also mention the power of rain the whole year, although it comes only at a fixed time. Therefore, if one wishes to mention the rain the whole year, one may do so (even in summer).

Rabbi says: I say: As soon as one ceases to pray for rain, one should cease to mention it. (This contradicts the opinion that one may mention the rain the whole year). R. Judah ben Bathyra says: One begins to mention the rain on the second day of the Feast of Booths; R. Akiba says: On the sixth day. R. Judah says in the name of R. Joshua: He who is the last to pass before the ark (in the additional prayer) on the last day of the Feast of Booths, mentions the rain, the first (in the ששון) does not. On the first day of Passover, the first

Rashi, but better none

does mention the rain, the last does not.

Well did R. Eliezer answer R. Joshua (in comparing the mention of rain with the resurrection of the dead). But R. Joshua ~~might have~~ ^{may} ~~answer~~ said: I grant what is said as to the mention of the resurrection of the dead, for it is always desirable, but is the same true of rain? Do we not read in the Mishna (Taanith 12 b): "If Nisan is over and the rain descends, it is a sign of God's ill-favor", for it ^{is} written, (1 Sam. 12:17): "Is it not wheat harvest to-day? I will call unto the Lord, and he will send thunders and rain; and ye will perceive that your wickedness is great " etc.?

R. Judah ben Bathyra says: On the second day of the Feast of Booths, one begins to mention the rain; What is his reason? It is taught in a Baraitha: R. Judah ben Bathyra says: In regard to the second day of the Feast of Booths it is said (Num. 29:19) "And their libations" (ז'ב'ס'ס'); in regard to the sixth day it is said (Num. 29:31): "And its libations" (ז'ב'ס'); in regard to the seventh day it is said (Num. 29:33): "According to their regulation" (ז'ב'ס'ס'). There is an extra Mem in ז'ב'ס'ס' , a Yod in ז'ב'ס' and a Mem in ז'ב'ס'ס' ; these three letters form the word ז'ב' (water). Here is therefore an intimation of the Water-libation from the Thora. But why does R. Judah take the second day on which to begin the mention of rain? Since the intimation in the Thora as to water is first found in ז'ב'ס'ס' in connection with the second day, therefore he thinks one should begin to mention the rain on the second day.

R. Akiba says: On the sixth day of the Feast of Booths, one begins to mention the rain, for it is said (Num. 29:31) in connection with the sixth day: "And its libations." Of two libations the Scripture here speaks: one of water (therefore one begins to mention on the sixth day) and one of wine. But suppose I say both libations are of wine. (What basis would R. Akiba then have for his conclusion?) He would derive it in the same manner as R. Judah ben Bathyra who holds that the extra letters give an intimation of water (and hence to the mention of rain). (folio 3a) If R. Akiba derives his conclusion in the same manner as R. Judah ben Bathyra, then he ought to hold also that the mention of rain begins on the second day. R. Akiba might say in support of his opinion, that inasmuch as the extra libation (וְיָסַף) is spoken of in connection with the sixth day (therefore one begins the mention of rain on that day).

It is taught in a Baraitha: R. Nathan says: It is written (Num. 28:7): "In the holy-place pour out a libation of strong drink to the Lord." Of two libations, Scripture is here speaking, one of water and one of wine. But it might be said that both are of wine. If so the text should have read וְיָסַף וְיָסַף or וְיָסַף וְיָסַף; since it reads וְיָסַף וְיָסַף, we infer one is of water and one of wine.

But we read in the Mishna: The libation of water shall be all seven days. With whom does this agree? According to R. Joshua (who begins on the seventh day), the libation would be only one day; according to R. Akiba (who begins on the sixth day), only two days; accor-

Why... day? Is it not because an intimation is
given only in connection with the second day?
If so one should not ~~mention~~ mention
the rain on the eighth day either since
the intimation (pslas) is given only in
connection with the seventh day.

We must therefore pass the Mishnah on
the authority of R. Joshua and although
he holds that we begin to mention the
rain on the seventh day still in the case
of the libation he had a tradition etc.

ding to R. Judah ben Bathyra (who begins on the second day), only six days. But I still maintain this Mishna agrees with R. Judah ben Bathyra (that one begins the mention on the second day), and the opinion of a certain R. Judah of the Mishna is a confirmation, for the Mishna teaches: R. Judah says: By the log (a liquid measure) one used to pour out the libation all eight days. (They agree as to a libation on the eighth day.) This Mishna excludes the first day and includes the eighth. (This would agree with R. Judah ben Bathyra who begins the mention of rain on the second day. ^{what?} It would also agree with the former [?] Mishna which says the Water-libation continues seven days).

Why does one not begin the mention of rain on the first day? Since an intimation is given as to water in connection with the second day, (therefore one begins to mention rain on that day). Is there however, any intimation as to water for the eighth day? It is written ~~וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ~~ on the seventh day (and not on the eighth).

Therefore it may still be maintained that the law is according to R. Joshua (who said one begins to mention rain on the seventh day), but the Water-libation for seven days is a law which we have by tradition, for R. Ammi said that R. Jochanan said in the name of R. Nechunya of Bikath beth Chorthan: the law concerning ten young trees (scattered in a field etc.), the custom of the procession with the willow branch and that of the Water-libation (during seven days) are traditional laws handed down from Moses on Sinai.

R. Judah says in the name of R. Joshua: He who is the last to pass

before the ark (for the additional prayer) on the last day of the Feast of Booths, mentions the rain, the first does not. On the first day of Passover, the first (in the morning prayer) does mention the rain, the last does not.

Which R. Joshua is here spoken of? Shall I say it is R. Joshua of our Mishna (Ta'anith 2 a)? No, for he says: On the last day of the Feast of Booths, one mentions the rain (no distinction being made between the first who comes before the ark and the last). Is it R. Joshua of the Baraitha? No, for he says one begins to mention the rain when the Lulab is put away (on the seventh day and here it is taught: On the last day (the eighth), one begins to mention the rain).

Furthermore it is taught in a Baraitha: R. Judah says in the name of Ben Bathyra: He, who is the last to pass before the ark on the last day of the Feast of Booths, mentions the rain. Which Ben Bathyra is here spoken of? Shall I say it is R. Judah ben Bathyra? No, for he says: One begins to mention the rain on the second day. Rab Nachman bar Isaac says: The R. Joshua and Ben Bathyra about whom you ask are one and the same person: R. Joshua ben Bathyra. At times he was called by his own name (R. Joshua) and at other times he was called by his father's name (Ben Bathyra). He was called Ben Bathyra before he was ordained and R. Joshua afterwards.

It is taught: The Rabbis do not oblige one to mention the dew and the winds (to say *בשמי' ברוח ו/ו ד' ד' ה' ט' ה'* even in the rainy season). But if one wishes to mention them he may do so. Why do the Rabbis not make

it obligatory to mention them? R. Chanina said: Because they are not withheld. Whence do we know that dew is not withheld? It is written (1 K. 17:1): "Then said Elijah, the Thishbite who was of the inhabitants of Gilead, unto Achab: As the Lord, the God of Israel liveth, before whom I have stood, there shall not be in these years dew or rain except according to my word." And it is also written (1 K. 18:1): "Go, show thyself unto Achab, and I will give rain upon the face of the earth." What is the reason that Elijah does not mention the dew? Because it is not (folio 3 b) withheld.

If then it is never with-held from the world why did Elijah take such an oath (that there would not be dew or rain except by his word)? Elijah really meant that there would be no dew of blessing (which is beneficial to every plant). But he could have ^{repeated} returned the dew of blessing (therefore he should have said: "And I will give dew and rain.") He omitted it because it is something imperceptible. (He does not mention the dew of blessing so that Achab could not say it had ^{not} never been with-held).

Whence do we know that the winds are not with-held? R. Joshua ben Levi says: Scripture says: (Zach. 2:10): "As the four winds of the heavens I have spread you out, saith the Lord," What did the Prophet mean? Shall I say God spoke to Israel thus: "For I have scattered you unto the four quarters of the world." If so, the text should not read ~~וְאַתְּ~~ but ~~וְאַתְּ~~. But what is really meant is this: As the world cannot exist without winds, so can it not exist without Israel.

read: But to this objection (that it might
refer to rain) he (R. Jacob) could answer:
Scripture says.... consequently rain was
already mentioned before; to what shall
I then refer the words and ^{clouds} and winds? ^{Certainly} ~~For~~
to nothing else but to clouds and winds,
and this causes a contradiction etc.

R. Chanina said: Therefore in the hot season (from Nisan to the Feast of Booths) if one has said: "He who causes the wind to blow" (*הוא שנותן רוח*), he need not repeat his prayer (for the wind is never withheld). If one has said: "He who causes the rain to descend" (*הוא שנותן מטר*) he must repeat his prayer ^{and must not say "amen"} (for rain in summer is a sign of God's ill-favor). In the rainy season, if one has not said: "He who causes the wind to blow" (*הוא שנותן רוח*), he need not repeat his prayer. If he has not said: "He who causes the rain to descend" (*הוא שנותן מטר*), he must repeat his prayer. And not only this, but even if one insert in one's prayer: "He who removes the wind and keeps the dew from descending," he need not repeat his prayer (for wind and dew are not withheld).

It is taught: The Rabbis do not make it obligatory to mention clouds and winds, but if one wishes to mention them, one may do so. Why do the Rabbis not make this obligatory? It is because they are never withheld. Is it true that they are not withheld? Does not Rab Joseph teach: It is written (Dt. 11:17): "And he will shut up the heavens?" (From what will he shut up the heavens?) Is it not from the clouds and the winds? Some one might answer R. Joseph: You say from the clouds and the winds: I say it is from the rain. For Scripture says immediately after (Dt. 11:17): "And there shall be no rain"; therefore I conclude rain is meant. How then are we to understand R. Joseph when he ^{therefore} ~~takes~~ the verse "And he will shut up the heavens" ^{if not} as referring to clouds and winds?

^{therefore} There is a contradiction in the case of clouds and also in the case of winds! No, in the case of clouds there is no contradiction. In

A refers to a wind which blows gently...

the one instance as to clouds, the early clouds are meant (which come before the rain and are not with-held); in the other instance as to clouds, the late clouds are meant (which come after the rain and are with-held). Nor is there any contradiction as to winds. In the one instance an ordinary wind is meant (which is never with-held); in the other instance, an extraordinary wind is meant (which is with-held). But the extraordinary wind is a good thing for the threshing-floor. (We ought therefore to mention it since it is sometimes with-held). The winnowing may be done with a fan (independently of the wind).

It is taught: The clouds and the winds are ^{almost (in the second degree)} as beneficial as rain. In what cases are we to understand this? R. Ula says, and some say it was R. Judah: The clouds and winds which come after the rain. But can one say that such are beneficial? Is it not written (Dt. 28:24): "The Lord will give as the rain of thy land powder and dust." (They are harmful, for the wind takes up the dust after the rain and makes it stick to the grain). ^{and Ula commented upon this verse as meaning just the wind after the rain?} But Ula says and some say it was R. Judah: Winds and clouds after rain are beneficial. ^{there is no contradiction} Is there not here a contradiction? No, ^{when it} in the one case they blow gently and do not raise the dust; in the other, they blow heavily and do raise the dust. (The former is beneficial, the latter is not.)

R. Judah further says: Winds after rain are as beneficial as rain; a covered sky after the rain is as beneficial as rain, while the sun after rain is as beneficial as two rains. (Since all of these are as beneficial as rain) what does come after rain which is excluded

(which is not as beneficial as rain). The glow after sunset is excluded, *and* the sun between the clouds. (When in one spot in the heavens, the sun shines, and not in another, like hair growing here and there on a bald head). Raba said: Snow to the mountains is as beneficial as five rains to the earth, for it is written (Job 37:6): "For to the snow he saith: Be thou upon the earth; likewise to the pouring rain and to the pouring rain of his strength" (שׁוֹלג, גֶּשֶׁם, מַטְרָא are each one and מַטְרָאֵם being plural is regarded as two; hence five rains).

Raba further said: Snow is beneficial for the mountains, a heavy rain for the trees, a gentle rain for the produce (folio 4a), a drizzling rain even for the kernels under a hard clod. What is the etymology of מַטְרָאֵם? It is made up of מַעַל, מַעַל (Wake up, ye cracks of the soil).

Raba further said: The young student is like the kernel under the heavy clod, for when it once breaks through, it grows fast. (Thus does the fame of the student spread). Raba furthermore said: When a young student gets angry, it is his zeal for the Law that excites him, for it is said (Jer. 23:29): "Is not my word like fire? saith the Lord". And R. Ashshe said: Every young student who is not as hard as iron is no student, for it is said (Jer. 23:29): "And like a hammer that shivereth the rock". R. Abba said to R. Ashshe: You derive this from the verse in Jeremiah, I however, derive it from the following (Dt. 8:9): "A land whose stones are of iron". Do not read מַטְרָאֵם (its stones), but מַבְנֵי (its builders). But Rabbina said: Nevertheless one ought to train one's self to be gentle, for it ^{is} said (Ecc. 11:10): "And thou

shalt remove anger from thy heart."

R. Samuel bar Nachmani says in the name of R. Jonathan: Three persons made unreasonable demands (making their actions dependent upon chance); two of them were answered properly (Providence favoring their ways), one was not. The three were: Eliezer, the servant of Abraham, Saul, the son of Kish and Jephthah, the Gileadite. Eliezer the servant of Abraham was the first, for it is written (Gen. 24:14): "And it shall come to pass that the maiden to whom I shall say: let down thy pitcher shall be the one thou hast appointed for thy servant Isaac." She might have been lame or blind (for he had not specified in his prayer); but God answered him satisfactorily and Rebecca came to hand for him. Saul, the son of Kish, was the second, for it is written (1 Sam. 17:25): "And it shall come to pass that the man who shall slay the giant, the king will make him very rich and will give him his daughter. He might have been a slave or bastard (for the king had not specified in his prayer); but God answered him satisfactorily and David came forth for him. Jephthah the Gileadite was the third, for it is written (Judges 11:31): "Then shall it be, that whatever cometh forth from the doors of my house I will offer it up as a burnt offering." It might have been some unclean thing (a dog or a swine); God did not answer him satisfactorily and his daughter came forth. And this is what the prophet said to Israel (Jer. 8:22): "Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there?" (Jeremiah censures Jephthah for the latter might have gone to Phineas and had his vow annulled.) It is also written (Jer. 19:5): "What I have not com-

manded, nor spoken, nor thought of". "What I have not commanded" refers to the son of Mesha, king of Moab, for it is said (2 K. 3:27): "And he took his son, his first-born who was to rule in his place and he offered him up as a burnt-offering." "And I have not spoken" refers to Jephthah. "And it has not entered my mind" refers to Isaac, the son of Abraham.

R. Berechya said: The community of Israel, ^{also} made an unreasonable request, yet God answered it satisfactorily, for it is said (Hos. 6:3): "And let us feel it, that we may strive to know the Lord; bright as the morning-dawn is his rising, and he will come as the rain to us." God answered Israel: My daughter! thou askest a thing (rain) which is sometimes desirable and sometimes is not (in harvest time); but I will be unto thee something which is always desirable (dew); for it said (Hos. 14:5): "I will be as the dew to Israel." And Israel made another unreasonable request saying unto God: Ruler of the universe! (Cant. 8:6) "Put me as a seal upon thy heart, as a seal upon thine arm." God answered Israel: My daughter! thou askest a thing which is sometimes visible and sometimes not (when one is dressed); but I will do for thee something which is always visible for it is said (Is. 49:16): "Behold, upon the palms have I engraved thee."

The Mishna (Taanith 2 a) says: One does not pray for rain until the season for rain draws near. There was an opinion that praying (תפלה) and mentioning (הרהור) are one and the same. Who is it that teaches (one does not mention rain until the season for rain draws near?) Raba says: It is R. Joshua who says: One begins to mention the

rain from the time when one puts the Lulab away (which is the eighth day of the Feast of Booths, and this is about the time of the rainy season). Abaye said to Raba: You might also say it is R. Eliezer and that praying and mentioning are different (R. Eliezer says: From the time when the Lulab is taken up, one begins to mention the rain; he says nothing as to when one begins to pray for rain). Some say the Gemara should read as follows: Who is it that teaches (one does not mention the rain until the season for rain draws near). ^{shall we} I might say (folio 4 b): It is R. Joshua who says: One begins to mention the rain from the time when one puts the Lulab away; ^{said} Raba says: You might even say it is R. Eliezer and that praying and mentioning are different. (We omit the words: There was an opinion that praying and mentioning are different.)

R. Judah says: He who is the last to pass before the ark (in the $\eta\delta\lambda$ prayer) on the last day of the Feast of Booths mentions the rain, the first does not. On the first day of Passover, the first does mention the rain (in the $\eta\delta\lambda$ prayer), the last does not.

The Rabbis find this Mishna to be in conflict with the following Mishna (Taanith 5 a): How long does one pray for rain? R. Judah says: Until Passover is over. (In the Mishna quoted above R. Judah says: On the first day of Passover, he who is the last to pass before the ark, does not mention the rain); R. Meir says: Until Nisan is over. ^{shall} R. Chasda says: There is no contradiction; the latter Mishna refers to praying for rain, the former refers to mentioning it. In regard to praying for rain, one keeps on (until the end of Passover), but in regard to mentioning rain, one ceases (after the $\eta\delta\lambda$ prayer of the first day).

Ula says: This explanation of R. Chasda is hard (Prov. 10:26): "As vinegar is to the teeth and smoke is to the eyes." If in the time when one does not pray for rain (On the last day of the Feast of Booths, there is no prayer for rain ($\pi\lambda\kappa\omega$), for this is in the ninth benediction of the "Eighteen" and is not said on holidays), one mentions the rain (R. Judah says on the last day of the Feast of Booths one mentions the rain), at a time when one does pray for it (the days between the first and last days of Passover), how much the more should one mention it? *Therefore Ula says,*

There are two different Tannaim who report a tradition in the name of R. Judah. (One says: If one prays for rain until Passover is over, so much the more should one mention the rain; the other, that praying for rain continues to Passover and the mention of rain which can be repeated on a holiday is said on the first day of Passover in the prayer.) R. Joseph says: What is meant by the phrase: "Until Passover is over" ~~X~~ It means: Until the first public reader of prayers on the first day of Passover comes down from the Ark (This interpretation of the Mishna (5 a) would not contradict the other Mishna (2 a) in the name of R. Judah.) But Abaye said to R. Joseph: Is there any prayer for rain on a holiday? (The prayer for rain is in the ninth of the "Eighteen Benedictions " and is not said on holidays; R. Joseph would say it on the first day of Passover.) R. Joseph answered: Yes! there is a prayer for rain, that of the interpreter (in his discourse). But does the interpreter pray for something which the congregation does not need? (The argument of R. Joseph being weak, the opinion of Ula is

regarded as the more correct: that two different Tannaim report a tradition in the name of R. Judah.).

Rabba says: What is meant by the phrase: " Until the Passover is over ~~"?~~ It means until the time for the slaughter of the Pascal lamb is over (until noon of the fourteenth day of Nisan, the first day of Passover; this coincides with the view of R. Judah in the previous Mishna 2a). And there is an analogy between the beginning and the end of this subject (praying for and mentioning of the rain). As one begins the mention of rain (on the last day of the Feast of Booths) altho one does not pray for it (until after the festival), so at the end, one mentions the rain (until the ~~901~~ prayer of the first day of Passover), altho one has ceased praying for it (the day before Passover). But Abaye answered him: I grant what you say in regard to the mentioning at the beginning, for mentioning is a kind of a propitiation preparatory to the praying for rain (One says these propitiatory words because one cannot pray for rain on a holiday; since the praying follows, the mention may have been as a propitiation), but at the end, what need is there for a preparatory propitiation. (Why mention the rain when one no longer needs to pray for it ?) The opinion of Ula is regarded as the more correct (that two Tannaim report a teaching in the name of R. Judah).

R. Assi said in the name of R. Jochanan: " The law is according to R. Judah " Then said R. Zera to R. Assi: Did R. Jochanan say the law is according to R. Judah ? (The last to pass before the ark on the last day of the Feast of Booths, mentions the rain.) Do we not read in the

Mishna(Taanith 10 a): On the third day of the month of Marchesvan, one begins to pray for rain; Rabban Gamaliel says: on the seventh day of that month. R. Elazar says: The law is according to Rabban Gamaliel. (How then could R. Jochanan say: The law is according to R. Judah who would begin to mention the rain on the last day of the Feast of Booths?) R. Assi answered R. Zera: You quote R. Elazar who is no more authoritative than R. Jochanan. But if you wish, I may say that there is no contradiction (between the opinions of these two men). In the one case, reference is made to praying for rain (on the seventh of Marchesvan); in the other case to the mention of rain (on the last day of the Feast of Booths). Did not R. Jochanan say: At the time when one prays, one mentions; when one does not pray, one does not mention? (How could R. Jochanan say the law is according to R. Judah: that one mentions the rain on the last day of the Feast of Booths, when there is no prayer for rain). R. Jochanan only spoke with reference to ceasing from both the mention of, and the praying for rain. (He does not refer to beginning). But did not R. Jochanan say: When one begins to mention, one begins to pray (on week-days). When the prayer ceases, the mention ceases also. (On the day before Passover one ceases to mention. How then could R. Jochanan say the law is like R. Judah who says rain is mentioned on the first day of Passover ?)

But there is no contradiction (between R. Jochanan who holds to the opinion of R. Judah, and R. Elazar who is of the same opinion as Rabban Gamaliel). In the one case, Babylon is referred to; in the other Palestine is meant. In Babylon the produce is still in the fields (during

Why should we Babylonians differ (according
to you), is it not because we still have
at that time produce in the field?
Now the Palestinians can advance just
as strong a reason since they have
pilgrims on the road. No, they
have no reason because R. Joh. refers
to the ~~after~~ the destruction of the Temple.
Now (the Talmud says) since we
arrived at this point (making a
distinction between the time before and
that after the destruction) we can
even say that both cases refer to
Palestine ^{and still there is no contradiction} but one refers to the time
before the destr. and the time after.

the entire month of Tishri and one does not begin to mention rain until the seventh of Marchesvan, hence R. Jochanan says: When one begins to mention, one begins to pray for rain); in Palestine (they harvest in Tishri, therefore one mentions rain on the last day of the Feast of Booths).

Why do you give as a reason for the distinction that in Babylon the produce is still in the fields in Tishri; the same is true in Palestine. Is it not rather on account of the pilgrims (whose return from Palestine would be made difficult if the rains came before they reached home)? But when R. Jochanan said: The law is according to R. Judah, he referred to the time when the Temple was no more in existence (and there were no pilgrims). If you do not agree to this opinion I will say that R. Jochanan in both cases refers to Palestine and there is no contradiction. When the Temple was in existence (there were pilgrims, hence there was no mention of rain until the seventh of Marchesvan); when the Temple was no more (there were no pilgrims, hence they began to mention rain on the last day of the Feast of Booths).

Since we have two days, either of which might be the proper day, how shall we act? (In this case, it is uncertain which is the last day of the Feast of Booths. When then, according to R. Judah, should one begin to mention the rain)? Rab said: One begins to mention the rain in the $\frac{7}{8}$ prayer (of the eighth day which might be the seventh or last day of the Feast of Booths). One omits the mention of rain in the afternoon prayer (Perhaps the day is no holiday and there is no mention

and the decision is: who - the

of rain until the $\eta\theta\iota\kappa$ prayer of the following day), of the ninth day (which might be the eighth) and also in the evening prayer of the ninth day and the morning prayer of the ninth day. One begins again to mention the rain in the $\eta\theta\iota\kappa$ prayer (of the ninth day).

Samuel said to his students: Go and tell my colleague: Since you have made the day a holiday (the eighth day which may be the seventh. By mentioning the rain on it, it is regarded as a holiday), how can you again make it an ordinary day (by omitting the mention of rain in the afternoon prayer of that day)? But said Samuel: One begins the mention of rain in the $\eta\theta\iota\kappa$ prayer (of the eighth day which is possibly the seventh), and continues in the afternoon prayer (of that day), omits the mention in the evening and morning prayers (of the ninth day, which is possibly the eighth), then begins again to mention the rain in the $\eta\theta\iota\kappa$ prayer (of the ninth day). (folio 5a) Raba said: When one has begun to mention the rain there is no interruption, and R. Shesheth is of the same opinion. Even Rab changed his opinion, for R. Chananel said in the name of Rab: One counts twenty one days from New Year's Day in the same way as one counts ten days from New Year's Day to the Day of Atonement (From New Year's Day until the seventh day of the Feast of Booths, there are twenty one days); when one begins the mention of rain, there is no interruption.

Mishna: How long should one continue to pray for rain? R. Judah says: Until Passover is over; R. Meir says: Until the end of Nisan, for it is said (Joel 2:23): " And he will send down for you the early rain and the late rain in the first (month). "

Gemara: Rab Nachman said to Rab Isaac: Is the early rain in Nisan? The early rain is in Marchesvan, for it is taught: The early rain is in Marchesvan and the late rain in Nisan. Rab Isaac then said to Rab Nachman: R. Jochanan spoke thus: (The early rain really was in Nisan) in the days of Joel, the son of Pethuel (when a miracle was performed) then was this verse fulfilled, for it is written (Joel 1:4): " What the caterpillar left, hath the locust eaten; and what the locust left, hath the canker-worm eaten; and that which the canker-worm left, hath the cricket eaten." (There had been seven years of famine but through the miracle, we learn (Joel 2:25): plenty is again given to the land). During that year, Adar passed without rain, the first rain fell on the first of Nisan. Then said the prophet to Israel: Go out and sow the fields. They answered the prophet: If a man have a measure (one sixth of a Seah) of wheat or two measures of barley, shall he eat it and live or sow it and die? Then said the prophet: In spite of this, go out and sow the fields. A miracle happened and they found what was in the walls (carried there by the mice) and what was in the ant-holes. Then they went out and sowed the fields on the second, third and fourth days of Nisan, and on the fifth, the second rain came down. On the sixteenth of Nisan, they brought the Omer (of barley offered on this day, Lev. 23:10-14). The result was that the grain which usually required six months (from Tishri to Nisan) to ripen, in this case, required only eleven days (from the fifth to the sixteenth of Nisan), and the Omer which was usually brought from a growth of six months, was brought from an eleven days growth. Of this generation does the Psalmist say (Ps. 126:

5-6): " They who sow in tears shall reap in joy. He goeth forth indeed and weepeth, that beareth the seed for sowing; but he will surely come in joy when he beareth home his sheaves. " What is understood by " He goeth forth indeed and weepeth ? " (Reference is here not made to man but to the ox). R. Judah said: The ox when he plows, weeps as he goes on, but on his return he eats the corn from the furrows and this is the meaning of " He will surely come in joy. " What is understood by " When he beareth home his sheaves " ? R. Chasda said, and some say it is taught in a Baraitha: A stalk one span in height had an ear of two spans. (This was a miracle).

Rab Nachman said to Rab Isaac: What is meant by the verse (2 K. 8: 1): " For God called the famine and it too came upon the land for seven years " ? In these seven years what did they eat ? Rab Isaac said: Thus spoke R. Jochanan: In the first year they ate what was in their houses; in the second, they ate what was in the fields; in the third, the flesh of clean animals; in the fourth, the flesh of unclean animals; in the fifth, the flesh of abominations and reptiles; in the sixth, the flesh of their sons and daughters; in the seventh year, that of their own arms, in fulfillment of what is said (Is. 9: 19): " Each one eats the flesh of his own arm ".

Rab. Nachman furthermore said to Rab Isaac: What is the meaning of the verse (Hos. 11: 9): " In thy midst is the Holy One and I will not come into the city ". Because the Holy One is in thy midst, will I not come in the city. (Because thou hast done well, shall God not come into the city ?) Rab Isaac answered him: What R. Jochanan really meant is

this: God said: I will not come into the heavenly Jerusalem until I come into the earthly Jerusalem. But is there a heavenly Jerusalem? Yes, for is it not written (Ps. 122:3): " Jerusalem which is built as a city bound together "? (The earthly Jerusalem being differently built, there must be another, and where can that other be if not above ?)

Rab Nachman furthermore said to Rab Isaac: What is the meaning of the verse (Jer. 10:8) " And with one thing they are become brutish and foolish, it is a doctrine of vanity, it is wood "? Rab Isaac answered:

R. Jochanan really meant: One sin it is which consumes the wicked in Gehinnom. What sin is here referred to? That of idolatry, for it is written here: " It is a doctrine of vanity, it is wood " and it is written (Jer. 10:15): " They are vanity, the work of deception ". (An analogy based on the word ~~לעז~~^{לעז} which occurs in reference to punishment and also to idols.)

Rab Nachman furthermore said to Rab Isaac: What is the meaning of the verse (Jer. 2:13): " For two evils have my people practiced "? Were there only two? Were there not twenty-four? (Another reading has twenty-two), sins which were forgiven them ? Rab Isaac answered: R. Jochanan really meant: That one sin which is equivalent (folio 5 b) to two. What was this sin? Idolatry, for it is written (Jer. 2:13): " For two evils have my people done, we have they abandoned, the fountain of living waters, to hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that cannot hold water ". (This is one evil). It is also written of them (Jer. 2:10-11): " For pass over to the isles of the Kittites (Cyprus), and see; and unto Kedar (Crete) send and con-

sider well;hath a nation changed its gods even though they were not gods,yet my people hath changed its glory for a profitless thing." (This is the second sin,the renunciation of God for a worthless thing). It is taught: The people of Cyprus worship fire and those of Crete worship water,and although they know that the water subdues the fire,they do not change their God,but my people hath changed its glory for something which is profitless.

Rab Nachman further said to Rab Isaac: What is the meaning of the verse ('1.Sam. 8:2): " And it came to pass when Samuel grew old"? And did Samuel grow old at all? Indeed he was but fifty-two years old, for it is said by way of tradition: If a man die at the age of fifty-two,he reaches the age of Samuel the Ramathite. Rab Isaac answered:R. Jochanan really meant:Samuel grew old prematurely.(His hair became white.),for it is written (1.Sam.15:11): " I repent that I have made Saul king." (God wanted to kill him at once). Then said Samuel before God: Master of the Universe!Thou hast made me like unto Moses and Aaron for it is written (Ps.99:6): " Moses and Aaron were among his priests and Samuel among those who call upon his name." Just as Moses and Aaron did not have their work put to nought in their life (Joshua was the pupil of Aaron) , so let not my work be undone in my life. (Samuel had anointed Saul king). God said: What shall I do? If I slay Saul, Samuel ^{does} will not ^{allow} forgive it,if I kill Samuel while he is young, people will speak ill of him. (Having died young,they will regard him as a sinner.) If I put to death neither Saul nor Samuel,then the reign of David will arrive and one kingdom must not overlap another even as

much as a hair's breadth; therefore God said: I will make Samuel prematurely old.

This is the meaning of the verse (1.Sam.22:6): " Now Saul was sitting in Gibeah under the tamarisk in Ramah (on Mt.Ephraim). What has Gibeah to do with Ramah? The two are brought together to give the reason why Saul remained in Gibeah two and one-half years; it was because of the prayer of Samuel of Ramah.

But is one man pushed aside to make room for another (Samuel being pushed aside for David)? Yes! for Samuel bar Nachmani said in the name of R.Jonathan: What is the meaning of the verse (Hos.6:5): " Therefore did I hew them down by the prophets; I slew them by the words of my mouth." " By their deeds," it is not said, but, " by the words of my mouth " (not on account of sin, but because of what I have decreed); hence one man may be pushed aside to make room for another.

Rab Nachman and R.Isaac were eating a meal together. R.Nachman said to R.Isaac: Expound something to me. R.Isaac said to Rab Nachman: Thus said R.Jochanan: One should not speak in the course of a meal lest the food go into the windpipe before it reaches the gullet, and one come into danger of choking. After the meal R.Isaac said to Rab Nachman: Thus spoke R.Jochanan: Jacob our father did not die. Whereupon Rab Nachman said: Is it for nought that the mourners mourned for him and the embalmers embalmed his body and the grave-diggers buried him? Then said Rab Nachman: I derive it from the following verse, for it is said (Jer. 30:10): " But thou, do not fear, my servant Jacob, saith the Lord, and do not be afraid, O Israel; for, behold, I will save thee from

afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity. " R. Jochanan makes an analogy on the basis of the word ^{alive} ~~eternal~~. Just as Jacob's posterity is ^{alive} ~~eternal~~, so is Jacob himself ~~eternal~~. (The embalmers were deluded in thinking him dead. The living only could be in captivity, hence Jacob could not have died.)

R. Isaac said: Any one who says Rachab, Rachab, becomes at once polluted. Rab Nachman answered him: I said it and nothing happened to me. Then said R. Isaac: I mean in the case of one who recognizes her and is acquainted with her. When Rab Nachman parted from R. Isaac, he said: Give me your blessing. R. Isaac answered: Let me tell thee a parable. To what is this incident like? To a traveler who journeys through the desert. When weary, hungry and thirsty, he finds a tree whose fruit is excellent, its shadow refreshing, and a spring of water flowing at its base. The traveler ate of the fruit, drank of the water, and rested under the shade. When about to depart, he said: O tree, O tree with what words can I bless thee? How can I wish for thee that thy fruit be excellent, when thy fruit is excellent? How can I wish that thy shade be refreshing; for this blessing thou hast also? Or how can I wish for thee that a spring of water shall flow at thy base, since thou hast this likewise? But may it be God's will that all thy branches which come from thee (foliis & a) may be like thyself. So with you; with what shall I ask God to bless you? Not with Thora, for thou hast this, not with wealth, for thou hast this also, nor with sons, for these too, are thine. But may it be God's will that thy offspring may be as blessed as thyself.

It is taught: The first shower which comes down in Marchesvan, why is it called חורף? Because it teaches people to plaster their roofs (that the rains may not soak through), to bring in the produce (which has been left in the fields to dry) and to make all other preparations for the rainy season. Another explanation of חורף is that it fructifies the earth and waters it to the depths, for it is said (Ps. 65:11): " Watering her furrows abundantly, smoothing down her ridges, thou softenest her with showers; thou blessest her growth." Still another explanation of חורף is that it comes down gently and not heavily (like a teacher who teaches with gentleness, or like an arrow which one shoots, and which goes straight to the mark).

Or, חורף may not be a blessing, but a curse, hence it may get its name because it knocks down the fruit of the trees, or washes away the seed and the young trees. But no! Scripture speaks of חורף and מטר together, just as the late rain is a blessing, so is the early rain a blessing. But may it not be that the late rain overturns houses and breaks down trees and brings the crickets (hence it is a curse)? No! Scripture speaks of the early rain; just as the early rain is a blessing, so is the late rain. But whence do we know that the early rain is a blessing? It is written (Joel 2:23): " And ye children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the Lord, your God, for he hath given you the early rain for a blessing and has caused to come down for you the rain, the early rain and the late rain in the first month."

It is taught; The early rain is in Marchesvan, the late rain in Nisan. You hold to this opinion, but may it not be that the early rain

is in Tishri and the latter rain in Iyar? No! Scripture says (Dt. 11: 14): " That I will send rain for your land in its due season, the early rain and the late rain "(in Marchesvan and Nisan). Why is the late rain called $\omega\text{ר}^{\text{ב}}\text{ב}$? Rab Nehilai bar Idi said in the name of Samuel: Because it crushes the stiff-neckedness of Israel (by fasting and prayer). The school of R. Ishmael teaches that $\omega\text{ר}^{\text{ב}}\text{ב}$ is so called because it is that which fills the grain in its stalks. In a Baraitha it is taught that $\omega\text{ר}^{\text{ב}}\text{ב}$ is that which falls upon both ears and stalks.

It is taught: The early rain is in Marchesvan and the late rain in Nisan. You say the early rain is in Marchesvan; may it not be in the month of Kislev? No! Scripture says (Dt. 11: 14): " I will send rain for your land in its due season, the early rain and the late rain; just as the late rain is in its due season, so is the early rain, (Marchesvan). (When Nisan is passed and rain comes down it is not an evidence of blessing).

It is taught in another Baraitha: The early rain is in Marchesvan and the late rain is in Nisan. This is the opinion of R. Meir, but the Rabbis say: The early rain is in Kislev. Who is authority for this latter statement? R. Chasda said: R. Jose, for it is taught: When is the time of the first rain-fall (in the autumn)? The first shower should come on the third day of Marchesvan, a middle one on the seventh and the last on the seventeenth of this month; this is the opinion of R. Meir. R. Judah says: The seventh, the seventeenth and the twenty-third of Marchesvan; R. Jose says: The seventeenth and twenty-third of Marchesvan, and the first of the month of Kislev. (These three showers are called the early

Roshi

rain.)

And likewise R. Jose used to say: The individuals (pious ones) do not fast until the first of Kislev (if no rain has fallen). (R. Jose is of the same opinion therefore, as the Rabbis who say: The early rain is in Kislev). Rab Chasda said: The law is according to R. Jose. Amemar teaches the words of Rab Chasda in this sense: On the third day of Marchesvan, one prays for rain; Rabban Gamaliel says on the seventh. Then Rab Chasda said: The law is according to Rabban Gamaliel (that one does not pray for rain until the seventh of Marchesvan).

Which opinion does the following support? For it is taught: Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel says: If the rain comes down for seven consecutive days, you may count among these days, the first, the second and the third rain-fall. With whom does the above agree? With R. Jose (for according to R. Jose there are seven days between each rain-fall as follows: from the seventeenth to the twenty-third, there are seven days inclusive of the first and last days; from the twenty-third to the thirtieth, there are seven days exclusive of the day of the last shower). Rab Chasda said: The law is according to R. Judah (who says the first shower is on the seventh day of Marchesvan and then one begins to pray for rain). I grant you that the time of the first rain-fall is the time when one begins to pray for rain, and the time of the third rain-fall is the time when the individuals begin their three fasts, but for what purpose is the time of the middle rain-fall? R. Zera said: For the sake of the vows, for we learn in the Mishna: He who vows (to abstain from something) (folio 3b) until the time of rain or until the rain comes down, this

means:until the second rainfall.(The plural being used (שני משלים),this means at least two;hence the second rainfall). Rab Z^Berid said:The second rainfall is for the olive-trees,for we learn in the Mishna:When is every man permitted to touch the poor man's share in the gleaning,the forgotten sheaves and the corner of the field? When the last troop of gleaners have gone through the fields. When is every man permitted to touch the poor man's share of the cutting (single grapes which have fallen off and also the single bunches)? When the poor pass through the vineyards(a second time). When is every man permitted to touch the poor man's share of the olive fields? When the second rainfall comes down.

What is really meant by שני משלים? Old men who walk with a staff. Resh Lakish said:They who gather after others have gathered. Rab Pappa said:The second rainfall gives the time up to which any man may walk in the private paths (to shorten his way;the grain cannot be harmed as yet).for Mar said:Any man may walk on the private paths until the second rainfall comes down.

Rab Nachman bar Isaac said: The second rainfall gives the time when one must consume the produce of the Sabbatic year (Lev.25:1-7), for we learn in the Mishna:How long is one permitted to enjoy the usufruct of the straw and the stubble? Up to the time of the second rainfall. What is the reason? Because it is written (Lev.25:7 D): " And for thy cattle and for thy beasts which are in the land;as long as the beasts have food in the field,you may feed your cattle from what you have in the house. (You may make use of the produce of the Sabbatic

year). When there is no more food in the field for the beasts (There is no straw or stubble, for after the second rainfall the rains have made them into manure.), you may not feed your cattle from what you have in your house. (You may not make use of the produce of the Sabbath year).

R. Abbahu said: What is the meaning of the word רַגְלֵי ? Something which fructifies the soil; Rab Judah is of the same opinion, for he said: Rain is the husband of the earth, for Scripture says (Is. 55:10): " For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return not thither, but water the earth and cause it to bear and be fruitful . . . "

R. Abbahu further said: The first rainfall (is satisfactory and you need no fast-day) when there is enough water to enter the ground to the depth of one hand-breadth; the second rainfall (is satisfactory), when the soil is fit to be used for sealing the mouth of a cask. Rab Chasda furthermore said: As soon as sufficient rain has come down to make the soil fit for sealing the mouth of a cask, the curse of shutting up the heavens (so that rain does not come) -Dt. 11:17 - no longer obtains.

Rab Chasda furthermore said: If the rain comes down before the time for reading שמע ישראל (in the Shema), the curse no longer obtains. Abaye said: I say that only when the rain comes down before the שמע ישראל (in the Shema) of the evening, does the curse not obtain, but if it comes down before the שמע ישראל (in the Shema) of the morning, the curse does obtain. (If they do not come down in the day-time, they are not ^{substantial} beneficial to the world.) For Rab Judah bar Isaac said: These clouds of the morning are of no significance, for it is written (Hos. 6:4): " What shall I do unto

thee, O Ephraim? What shall I do unto thee, O Judah? for ^{your} piety is as a
 morning cloud Then said Rab Pappa to Abaye: ^{But is} ~~Indeed, there is a~~
^{wrong} ~~there not a~~ proverb that if it rains when the doors are opened (in the morning)
 they say: Lay down thy bag, ass-driver, and sleep. (Do not export, for
 provisions will be cheap; hence rain before the Shema of the morning is
 beneficial)? ^{No} ~~But~~ there is no contradiction. In the one case (the pro-
 verb), the sky becomes covered with heavy clouds (hence the curse does
 not obtain); In the other case (Rab Abaye), the sky is covered with
 light clouds (hence the curse does obtain). Rab Judah said: Auspic-
 ious is the year whose Tebeth is a widow (without rain). Some say: Be-
 cause the halls (academies) are not empty; others say: Because the
 grain of that year will not be subject to blast. Is it true (that the
 year is auspicious if Tebeth is without rain)? Did not Rab Chasda say:
 Auspicious is the year whose Tebeth is ugly (the roads being muddy on
 account of rain)? There is no contradiction between Rab Judah and Rab
 Chasda. In the former case (Rab Judah means) when the rains have come
 sufficiently in Marchesvan; in the latter case (Rab Chasda means) when
 there was not sufficient rain before Tebeth.

Rab Chasda furthermore said: If rain comes down upon one part of a
 province and not on the other part, the curse of the heavens being shut
 up does not obtain. Is this true? Is it not written (Amos 4:7): "And
 I also with-held the rain from you three months before the harvest; and
 I caused it to rain on one city, and upon another city I caused it not
 to rain; one piece of land was rained upon, and another piece whereon it
 rained not, became dried up." ¶ They who have rain may supply the others

In the daily Prayer Book
for Sabbath beginning on Sunday

But Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: It is a curse for both (where rain does come down and where it does not, because so much rain spoils the produce). There is no contradiction between the opinions of Rab Chasda and Rab Judah in the name of Rab. In the latter case, Rab Judah means when too much rain comes; in the former case Rab Chasda means when enough comes (to one part of the province to supply the other part). Rab Ashshe said: This is also proved (from the wording of the verse), for it is written *וַיִּשְׁבּוּ* (Niphal), which means that it will be a place where the rain will stand (in pools; more than sufficient rain comes to one part of the province so that the other part can be supplied). It follows therefrom that ^{it is so.} (the argument is accepted).

R. Abbahu said: When does one begin to say a blessing over the rain? From the time the bridegroom goes out to meet the bride (when the falling rain-drops meet the water on the ground and bubble, according to others, when the rivulets formed by the rain meet each other in the gutters). What is this blessing? Rab Judah says in the name of Rab: " We thank thee, O Lord our God, for every drop which thou causest to come down for us. " And R. Jochanan closes it thus: " If our mouth were as full of song as the sea contains drops, and our tongue with chants as the multitude of its waves " , up to " Let not thy mercies abandon us in future, O Lord our God, as they have not in past. Blessed be He to whom a multitude of thanks is due. " A multitude of thanks, you give to God, why not all thanks? Raba said: Let one say: The power to whom all thanks are due. Rab Pappa said: One should therefore say both (folio 7 a) " The power to whom all thanks are due ", and, " He

to whom a multitude of thanks is due."

R. Abbahu said: Greater is the day of rain than the day of the resurrection, for the latter is only for the righteous, while the rain is for both wicked and righteous. This contradicts Rab Joseph who said: Since rain is as important as (not more so than) the resurrection of the dead, therefore the Rabbis have inserted it in the Blessing of the Resurrection (the second of the " Eighteen Benedictions "). Rab Judah said: The day of rain is as important as the day on which the Law was given, for it is said (Dt. 32:2): " My doctrine shall drop as rain ", and this can only refer to the Law, for it is said (Prov. 4:2): " For a goodly doctrine have I given you, my Law; do not abandon it ". Raba said: The day of rain is more important than the day of Revelation for it is said: (Dt. 32:2): " My doctrine shall drop as the rain ". How is one thing compared with another? May I not say that the less important is compared with the more important? (The Law being compared with rain, the latter is the more important).

Raba proposed the following question of contradiction between two passages: It is written (Dt. 32:2): " My doctrine shall drop as the rain " and it is also written (Dt. 32:2): " My speech shall distil as the dew. " (How can the same thing be compared to both dew and rain)? The answer is: If a student is worthy, he is like the dew, and if he is not worthy, drop him like rain.

It is taught: R. Bannaah used to say: Every one who studies the Law for its own sake, his study will become for him an elixir of life, for it is said (Prov. 3:18): " It is a tree of life to those who lay hold

of it"; also (Prov. 3:18): " Balm is it for thy flesh " and further (Prov. 8:35): " For who hath found me hath found life ". And every one who does not study the Law for its own sake (but with the hope of some reward), his study will become for him a deadly poison, for it is said (Dt. 32:2): " My doctrine shall drop like rain ". Now *נפ'ץ* is but a synonym for *נש'ר* (breaking the neck), for it is said (Dt. 21:4): " And they shall break there the neck of the calf in the valley. "

R. Jeremiah said to R. Zera: Will you not teach us some Halacha? R. Zera said: I am weak and I cannot. Then Jeremiah said: Will you not tell us some Haggada? R. Zera said: Thus said R. Jochanan: What is the meaning of the verse (Dt. 20:19): " For man is a tree of the field "? Is man really a tree of the field? But man is compared to a tree of the field, because it is written (Dt. 20:19): " For of them thou mayest eat, and thou shalt not cut them down, " it is also written (Dt. 20:20): " Only those trees thou mayest destroy and cut down ". (If it is a food tree, thou mayest eat of it) so with a student who is worthy (thou mayest benefit by his learning); but if the student is not worthy "thou shalt destroy him and cut him down".

R. Chama says in the name of R. Chanina: What is the meaning of the verse (Prov. 27:17): " Iron sharpens iron "? It means that just as one piece of iron is sharpened by another, so do two students whet each other's minds in the study of Halacha.

Rabba bar bar Chana said: Why are the words of the law compared to fire? Because it is said (Jer. 23:29): " Is not this like a fire? saith the Lord. " To teach that as fire does not burn if there be only one

quite remarkable! 5 times γ for δ .

piece of wood (there must be more),so the words of the Law are not established permanently by one student (unless another whet his mind). R. Jose bar Chanina said the same thing.

What is the meaning of the verse (Jer.50:36): " The sword is against the lying soothsayers and they shall be made foolish "? This means the sword is against the students (The text has the expression-haters of students-by euphemism.) who busy themselves one by one with the Law (who study alone). And not only is the sword against them, but they become dull,for it is said " And they shall be made foolish." But not only do they become foolish,but they also sin,for it is written here (Jer.50:36): " And they shall be made foolish " (/ 4 /), and it is written also (Num.12:11): " Alas,my Lord,do not,I beseech thee, account to us as sin that wherein we have done foolishly (/ 4 /) and wherein we have sinned." The inference is based on an analogy. (The form / 4 / is in the second passage followed by / 4 / , we have sinned). And if you wish,I might derive it (that he who studies alone sins) from the following verse (Is.19:13) " The princes of Zoan are become fools (/ 4 /) they have led Egypt astray." (They have sinned, 4 and 4 / being regarded as synonyms).

Rab Nachman bar Isaac said: Why are the words of the Law compared to a tree? Because it is said (Prov.3:18): " It is a tree of life to those who lay hold of it." To teach that as a small piece of wood can set fire to a large piece,so do youthful students whet the minds of the older scholars. (The younger students are always asking questions.) R.Chanina too said the same thing thus:Much have I gained from my teach-

ers, more from my fellow-students, but most of all from my pupils.

R.Chanina bar Papa proposed the following question of contradiction between two passages: It is written (Is.21:14): " To the thirsty bring water ", and it is also written (Is.55:1): " Behold, all ye who are thirsty, come ye unto water. " (There is no contradiction). If a man is a worthy student (the teacher ought to go to the student); if the student is unworthy (he must go to the teacher).

R.Chanina bar Chama proposed the following question of contradiction between two passages: It is written (Prov.5:16): " Let thy springs overflow abroad. " (The verse should be translated correctly as a question); and it is also written (Prov.5:17): " They shall be for thyself alone. " (There is no contradiction). In the former case, the student is worthy. (Tell him the secrets of the Law.); in the latter case the student is unworthy, therefore, " They shall be for thyself alone. "

R.Chanina bar Idi said: Why are the words of the Law compared to water, for it is written (Is.55:1): " All ye who are thirsty, come ye unto water "? To teach that just as water leaves a high place and flows to a low one, so are the words of the Law only preserved in him who is of humble disposition.

R.Oshaya furthermore said: Why are the words of the Law compared to these three liquids, water, wine and milk? Because it is written (Is. 55:1): " Behold, all ye who are thirsty, come ye unto the water, and he too that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat, yea come, buy without money and without price, wine and milk. " To teach that as these three liquids

Look! such magnificent knowledge
in ~~such~~ a vessel! (as H. Joshua)

are only preserved in the poorest of vessels, so are the words of the Law preserved only in him who is of humble disposition. The following teaches the same. ^a The daughter of the Emperor said to R. Joshua ben Chananya: If wisdom is such a beautiful thing, why is it preserved in so ugly a vessel (R. Joshua was very ugly though learned)? He said to her: Does not thy father put his wine in earthen vessels? She answered him: Yes, in what else should he put it? R. Joshua answered the princess: Since ^{you are so noble} ~~he~~ so values it, the Emperor should put the wine in golden and silver vessels. (He was speaking in jest). But the princess went and told her father (who acting on the suggestion) put his wine in golden and silver vessels, whereupon it soured. When they told this to the Emperor he said to his daughter: Who told you to do this? She answered: R. Joshua ben Chananya. They summoned R. Joshua and the Emperor said: Why did you give my daughter such advice? R. Joshua answered: When she said to me: (If wisdom is such a beautiful thing, why is it preserved in so ugly a vessel, then I answered her that just as wine is kept best in an ugly vessel, so is the Law preserved in me better than if I were handsome). But are there no handsome men who are also learned? (folio 7 b) Yes, but if they had been ugly, they would have been still greater scholars. There is another explanation for the comparison between the Law and the three liquids. As these three liquids only become spoiled by lack of concentration, so the words of the Law are only forgotten when the attention is diverted.

R. Chama bar Chanina said: The day of rain is as important as the day on which heaven and earth were created, for it is said (Is. 45:8):

"Drop down, ye heavens, from above, and let the skies distil blessing; let the earth open and let them be fruitful of salvation, and let righteousness spring up likewise; I, the Lord, have created it." It is not said: I have created them (heaven and earth), but I have created it (the rain). Rab Oshaya said: Important indeed is the day of rain for even salvation grows fruitful on it, for it is said (Is. 45:8): "Let the earth open and let them be fruitful of salvation."

R. Tanchum bar Chanilai said: The rain does not come down until the sins of Israel are forgiven, for it is said (Ps. 85:2-3): "Thou hast been favorable, O Lord, unto thy land (with water); the captivity of Jacob thou hast turned back. Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people; thou hast covered over all their sin. Selah." Mar Zeiri of Dihabath said to Rabbina: You make the above inference (that rain only comes down when Israel's sins are forgiven) from the verses here (Ps. 85:2-3) = I derive it from the following (L.K. 8:36): "Then do thou hear in heaven and forgive the sin of thy servants and thy people Israel. . . and do thou give rain upon their land."

R. Tanchum son of R. Chiya of Kephar Akka said: Rain is only withheld when the enemies of Israel (by Euphemism for Israel) have been condemned to destruction, for it is said (Job 24:19): "Drought and heat cause the melted snow to evaporate (They do not descend as rain,) so doth the grave (destroy) those who have sinned." Mar Zeiri of Dihabath said to Rabbina: You infer (that rain is only withheld when Israel is condemned to destruction) from Job 24:19; I derive it from the following verse (Dt. 11:17): "And he will shut up the heavens

... and you will perish quickly " (if you sin).

Rab Chasda said: The heavens are only shut up on account of the neglect in observing the laws of the priestly offerings and the tithes, for it is said (Job 24:9): " Drought and heat cause the melted snow to evaporate, they who have sinned come to the grave. " How does Rab Chasda derive ^{follow} this conclusion from this verse? It is taught in the school of R. Ishmael: On account of the things which I commanded you (נ' is explained from ו' and ו' is נ' in summer (offerings and tithes) and which ye have not observed the melted snow will deprive you of rain in the rainy season (winter).

R. Simeon ben Pazzi said: The heavens are only shut up on account of the gossipers, for it is said (Prov. 25:23): " The north wind removes the rain (brings light upon the world); so doth secret talking make the countenance of God morose. " (He will not bring rain upon the world.)

Rab Salla said in the name of Rab. Hamnuna: The heavens are only shut up on account of the insolent, for it is said (Jer. 3:3): " And though the early showers were withheld, and the late rain came not; yet thou hadst a forehead of an incestuous wife, thou refusest to feel shame. " Rab Salla furthermore said in the name of Rab Hamnuna: Any man who is insolent will ultimately stumble into sin, for it is said: " Yet thou hadst a forehead of an incestuous wife, thou refusest to feel shame. " Rab Nachman said: It is certain, for he has already fallen into sin. (The text has נ' - Past Tense - not נ' - Future).

Rabba bar Chuna said: Any man who is insolent may be called a wicked man, for it is said, (Prov. 21:29): " If a man show insolence,

you may call him a wicked man . . . to his face." Rab Nachman bar Isaac said: The insolent man may be hated, for it is said (Ecc. 8:1): " The boldness of his countenance will be disfigured. Do not read נִיָּוָה (may be disfigured) but נִיָּוָה (may be hated). (Since נִיָּוָה is written defectively, the verse is translated : The insolent man may be hated).

Rab Kat~~l~~ina said: The rains are only with-held because of neglect of study of the Law, for it is said (Ecc. 10:18): " Through laziness, God becomes weak." On account of the laziness of Israel in not busying herself with the study of the Law, God's enemy (euphemistic for God) becomes too weak (to bring down the dew and the rain). (This interpretation is based on the following: נֶבֶל means poor according to Lev. 27:8- " But if he be too poor for thy estimate " etc., and אֱלֹהִים means God according to Ps. 104:3- " Who frameth of the waters, the beams of his upper-chambers. "

Rab Joseph said: I infer that the rains are only with-held because of the neglect of the study of the Law, from the following passage (Job. 37:21): " Yet now men see not the light which is bright in the skies, when the wind hath passed along and purified them ". For נֶבֶל means the Law, as it is said (Prov. 6:23) " For the commandment is a lamp and the Law is a light. " The school of R. Ishmael teaches regarding the words (Job 37:21): " Which is bright in the skies " At the time when the sky appears full of white clouds and God wishes to send down the dew and the rain, then (Job. 37:21): " A wind passes by and purifies them ". (Its light scatters the rain clouds).

R. Ami said: The rains are only with-held because of the crime of

robbery, for it is said (Job 36:32): " On account of the hands, he covereth the light." On account of the crime of the hands, he covereth the light; ח'דד hands here refers to $\text{חבל$ robbery, for it is said (Jon. 3:8): " And from the violence (stolen things) which is in their hands." And ח'ל light refers to rain, for it is said (Job. 37:11) " The light empties the cloud of its rain." What is the remedy (for lack of rain)? One should pray much, for it is said (Job 36:32): " And God commanded the rain to come down because of one who entreated him. The expression ח'ל means prayer, for it is said (Jer. 7:16): " But thou, do not pray for this people. . . . do not entreat (ח'ל) me."

And R. Ami furthermore said: What is the meaning of the verse (Ecc. 10:10): " If the iron be blunt and man does not whet the edge " (it is bad). This means that if thou seest (the sky) as tough as iron, not sending down dew or rain, (it is) on account of the deeds of that generation which has done corruptly, for it is said (Ecc. 10:10): " And one does not whet the edge". What is the remedy (for such a generation)? It must make greater effort to obtain God's mercy, for it is said (Ecc. 10:10): " Then must he make more effort." And the meaning of the words: " And the advantage of doing it right is wisdom " is that (so much more rain would have come), if it had acted properly from the beginning.

Resh Lakish said: If thou seest a student whose study (folio 7 a) is as hard for him as iron, it is because his learning is not properly systematized in his mind, for it is said (Ecc. 10:10): " And if man

does not whet the edge ". What is the remedy? He shall go often to the school-house, for it is said (Ecc. 10:10): " Then must he make more effort ". And the meaning of the words: " And the advantage of doing it right is wisdom ", is that it would have been much better if at first his learning had been properly systematized in his mind. Like this teaching is the instance of Resh Lakish who used to repeat his lesson forty times, corresponding to the forty days in which the Law was given, before he went to recite to his teacher R. Jochanan. R. Ada bar Ahaba before going to recite to his teacher Raba used to repeat his lesson twenty-four times, corresponding to the number of the books of the Bible.

Raba said: If thou seest a student whose learning is as hard for him as iron, it is because of his teacher, who does not show him a kind face, for it is said (Ecc. 10:10): " If he does not show a friendly face, he has acted wrongly. " What is the remedy (for the student)? Let him bring many friends (to conciliate his teacher), for it is said: " Then must he make greater effort. "

And the meaning of the words: " And the advantage of doing it right is wisdom " is that it would have been so much better if his work from the beginning, had been done properly before his teacher.

R. Ami further said: What is the meaning of the verse (Ecc. 10:11) " If the serpent bites because no one uttered a charm, then hath the charmer no advantage. " This means that if thou seest a time when the heavens are as rusty as copper so that dew and rain cannot come down, it is because there is none in that generation to pray in a whisper. What

is the remedy for that generation? Let it go to one who knows how to pray in a low voice, as it is said (Job 38:33): "His friend shall pray for him." What is the meaning of the words: "Then hath the charmer no advantage"? This means: He who knows how to pray in a low voice and does not do so, ^{what benefit will he} he has no benefit. But if he does pray in a low voice and his prayer is not answered, what is he to do? He shall go to a pious man of his generation, who shall pray a great deal for him, for it is said (Job 38:32): "And God commanded the rain to come down because of one who entreated him". The expression means prayer, for it is said (Jer. 7:16): "But thou, pray not for this people, nor lift up in their behalf intercession or prayer, do not entreat (^{אֲדַוָּה}) me." But if one prays in a low voice and his prayer is answered and he becomes proud, he brings wrath upon the world, for it is said (Job 38:33): "He preserves his anger for the proud." Raba said: If two scholars live in one city and do not find pleasure in each other's opinions, they provoke ^{each other with} wrath ^{themselves} and bring it upon the world, for it is said (Job 38:33): "He preserves his anger for the proud."

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the verse (Ecc. 10:11): "If the serpent bites because no one uttered a charm, then hath the charmer no advantage." In the Messianic future all the animals will be gathered together and will come to the serpent and say to it: The lion attacks with its paws and eats its prey, the wolf tears its prey to pieces and eats it, but as for you, what satisfaction have you in fatally biting men? And the serpent will answer: "Then hath the charmer no advantage." (What satisfaction has the slanderer from his slander?)

He slanders though he has no satisfaction from it.)

R. Ami said: A man's prayer is not answered unless he has put his life in his hands, for it is said (Lam. 3:41): " Let us lift up our hearts with our hands ". Is R. Ami correct? Did not Samuel put an Amora by his side and lecture on the text (Ps. 78:36-7): " Nevertheless they prayed insincerely to him with their mouth, and with their tongue, they lied unto him. For their heart was not firm with him, and they were not faithful in his covenant ". In spite of this, it is said (Ps. 78:38): " But he being merciful forgave the iniquity " (Is there not a contradiction between R. Ami and Samuel)? No! there is no contradiction. R. Ami refers to the individual, while Samuel speaks of the community.

R. Ami said: Rain only comes down on account of the faithful, for it is said (Ps. 85:12): " Truth will grow up out of the earth and righteousness will look down from heaven. " (When there is honesty in business then will there be rain). And R. Ami furthermore said: Go and see how important are faithful men. From what shall one see this? From the story of the weasel and the well. (A young man promised to marry a young girl and as witnesses of his sincerity, he proposed a weasel and a well which he happened to see. He went away, forgot his promise and married another. His wife bore two sons, both of whom died; one fell into a well and the other was bitten by a weasel.) If one may trust the weasel and the well as reliable witnesses, how much the more should one trust in God.

R. Jochanan said: He who makes himself righteous here below is

judged righteously (strictly dealt with) in the judgment above (more so than if he had been evil in his ways so that his sins may be washed away), for it is said (Ps. 85:12): " Truth will grow up out of the earth and righteousness will look down from heaven ". (The text does not have *חַסְדִּים*, charity, but *צְדָקָה*, strict justice.) R. Chija bar Abbin said in the name of Rab Huna: The opinion that the righteous man is strictly dealt with above is derived from the verse (Ps. 90:11): " Against him who fears thee, thou dost increase thy wrath ". (To cleanse him of his sins). Resh Lakish drew the above conclusion from the following verse (Is. 64:4): " Thou dost afflict him who rejoiceth and worketh righteousness, (they who act thus) remember thee and thy ways: behold, thou art angry, if he sinned at all (in this world); but by them shall we be delivered forever (in the future world). " R. Joshua ben Levi said: He who cheerfully accepts the trials, which come upon him, brings salvation to the world, for it is said (Is. 64:4): " For by them (divine chastisements) shall the world be saved. "

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the verse (Dt. 11:17): " And he will shut up the heavens "? When the heavens are shut up so that the dew and the rain do not come down, it is like a woman who travails but does not give birth. This is what Resh Lakish said in the name of Bar Kappara: The expression *סָגַר* (shutting up) occurs in connection with rain and with women: (folio 8 b) with women, for it is said (Gen. 20:18): " For the Lord had surely shut up (*סָגַר* *רָחֵם*) every womb "; with rain, for it is written (Dt. 11:17): "

> omitted: 10.2 10.1 10.0 9.9 9.8 9.7 9.6 9.5 9.4 9.3 9.2 9.1 9.0 8.9 8.8 8.7 8.6 8.5 8.4 8.3 8.2 8.1 8.0 7.9 7.8 7.7 7.6 7.5 7.4 7.3 7.2 7.1 7.0 6.9 6.8 6.7 6.6 6.5 6.4 6.3 6.2 6.1 6.0 5.9 5.8 5.7 5.6 5.5 5.4 5.3 5.2 5.1 5.0 4.9 4.8 4.7 4.6 4.5 4.4 4.3 4.2 4.1 4.0 3.9 3.8 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.4 3.3 3.2 3.1 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0

" And he will shut up (**יעצר**) the heavens and there shall be no rain." The expression **לולד** (birth) occurs in connection with women and with rain; with women, for it is said (Gen. 30:23): "And she conceived and bare (**לולד**) a son"; with rain, for it is written (Is. 55:10): "For as the rain and snow come down from heaven and causes it (the earth) to bear (**לולד**) and to sprout. . . ." The expression **זכרון** (remembrance) occurs in connection with women and with rain; with women, for it is written (Gen. 21:1): " And God remembered (**זכר**) Sarah "; with rain, for it is written (Ps. 65:10): " Thou hast remembered (**זכר**) the earth, and waterest her abundantly; thou greatly enrichest her; the brook of God is full of water."

> It is taught: There is a sort of room in heaven from which the rains come down. R. Samuel bar Nachmani said: What is the meaning of the verse (Job 37:13): " Whether it be as a rod or for his land-if for kindness he causeth it (the rain) to come." "If as a rod"-this means (They come down heavily, as the rod of punishment smites heavily, but if the people repent, the heavy rains descend) on the mountains and the hills (uninhabited places where they do no harm). "If for kindness" (so that the rains descend gently) this means that he causeth it to come down for his land (Palestine) for its fields and vineyards. "If as a rod" this means for the trees. "If for his land", this means for the seeds; "if for kindness he causeth it to come ", this means for the wells, the cisterns and the caves.

In the days of R. Samuel bar Nachmani there occurred both a famine and a pestilence. The people said to him: What are we to do? Shall we

pray to God regarding both famine and pestilence? this we may not do. Or shall we pray that the pestilence be removed while we endure the famine? R. Samuel bar Nachmani answered them: Pray for the removal of the famine, for when God gives plenty, he gives it to the living, as it is written (Ps. 145: 16): " Thou openest thy hand and satisfiest the desire of every living creature." What Biblical basis have we for the opinion that one may not pray regarding two things? It is written (Ezra 8:23): " And we fasted and we prayed to God regarding this " (one thing); from this it is inferred that there must have been something else to pray for (but they only prayed for one thing). In the West they say in the name of R. Chaggai: The opinion that one may not pray for two things, is derived from the following (Dan 2:18): " In order that they might pray to the God of heaven concerning this secret ". Consequently there must have been something else (for which they did not pray).

In the days of R. Zera a decree was issued (against the Jews). It was decreed that they should not fast. R. Zera said to the people: Let us take upon ourselves the obligation to fast and when the decree is annulled, we will fast. The people said to R. Zera: How do you know that it is proper for us to do this? He answered them: It is written (Dan. 10:12): " And he said unto me: Do not fear, O Daniel, for from the first day when thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to afflict thyself before thy God, thy words were heard." (When he had taken upon himself the obligation, his words were heard).

R. Isaac said: Even if the years need rain as badly as in the

years of Elijah, should the rains descend on Friday, they are considered a curse (for one cannot go out to buy provisions for the Sabbath). Rabba bar Shila was of the same opinion, for he said : The day of rain is as hard as the Day of Judgment. (Men cannot do what is necessary. On the regular market days there is as great an uproar as on the Day of Judgment; how much the more on Friday). Amemar said: If rain is not necessary for life, let us pray to God to remove it (since it prevents man from going about). R. Issac furthermore said: The sun on the Sabbath is a benefit to the poor, for it is said (Mal. 3:20): " But there shall rise for you who fear my name (who keep my Sabbaths) the sun of righteousness and healing. "

R. Isaac furthermore said: The day of rain is indeed important for even the money in one's pocket is blessed by it (even business which does not require rain), for it is said (Dt. 28:12): " To give the rain of thy land in its season and to bless every work of thy hands. " And R. Isaac furthermore said: Blessing only rests upon that which is hidden from sight (the exact quantity of which one does not know), for it is said (Dt. 28:8): " The Lord will command upon thee the blessing in thy granaries. "

It is taught in the school of R. Ishmael: Blessing only rests upon that which the eye ~~can direct~~ ^{does not see}, for it is said (Dt. 28:8): " The Lord will command upon thee the blessing in thy granaries. "

It is taught: he who enters his granary to measure his harvest, says the following: May it be thy will, O Lord, our God, to send blessing upon the work of our hands. When he has begun to measure the harvest

he says: Blessed be he who sendeth blessing upon this heap. If he has already measured the harvest and then says the blessing, this is a vain prayer, because blessing does not rest upon a thing which has been weighed, measured or counted, but only on that which is hidden from sight (the exact quantity of which one does not know).

R. Jochanan said: The day of rain is as important as the day when the exiles are gathered up, for it is said (Ps. 126:4): " Return our captivity, O Lord, as the streams in the south " (מ'פ'דן). This word מ'פ'דן can only refer to rain, for it is said (2 Sam. 22:16): " And the channels of the sea were visible " (מ'פ'דן). R. Jochanan furthermore said: The day of rain is indeed important, for even invaders cease to march on it, for it is said (Ps. 65:11): " Just as thou waterest the furrows (of the earth with rain), so do its invaders rest ". R. Jochanan furthermore said: The rains are only withheld on account of those who subscribe publicly to charity and then refuse to pay, for it is said (Prov. 25:14) " Clouds and wind (They make it appear that rain is to come down), but there is no rain (on account of) the man who is ^{boastful} ~~praised~~ for a false gift. (He has publicly subscribed something, but does not pay). "

R. Jochanan further said: What is the meaning of the verse (Dt. 14:22): " Thou shalt truly tithe " (folio 9 a) (עשר תעשר)? Give tithes in order that thou mayest get rich. R. Jochanan met (his nephew) the child of Resh Lakish. Tell me the verse which is thy lesson, said R. Jochanan. " Thou shalt truly tithe " (עשר תעשר) was the answer. What is the meaning of this verse? Give tithes in order that thou mayest get rich, said the child. Said R. Jochanan, Where did you get

this opinion? The child answered: Go and test (this opinion; see if God rewards those who tithe). Then said R. Jochanan: Dare one thus try God? Is it not written (Dt. 3:18): "Ye shall not try the Eternal, your God?" But, said the child: Thus said R. Hoshaya: One may not try God except in this one instance of the tithes, for it is said (Mal. 3:10): "Bring ye all the tithes into the store house, that there may be provision in my house, and prove me in this, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open for you the windows of heaven, and pour out for you a blessing, until it be more than sufficient." What is the meaning of the expression

"until it be more than sufficient"? Rammi bar Chama said in the name of Rab: Until your lips grow tired of saying the word sufficient. R. Jochanan said: If I had come that verse (Mal. 3:10): "I would not have needed thee or Hoshaya ^{my teacher} in whose name you speak.

A second time R. Jochanan met the child of Resh Lakish. It was when the child was studying the verse (Prov. 19:3): "The folly of a man perverteth his way, and against the Lord will his heart rage-." (When a man sins, troubles come and he blames God). R. Jochanan sat down and said in surprise; Is there anything written in the Hagiographa which is not indicated in the Pentateuch? (The five books of Moses are regarded as the foundation of the Prophets and the Hagiographa). The child answered: Is this also not indicated in the Pentateuch? Is it not written (Gen. 42:28): "And their courage departed and they looked tremblingly at each other, saying: What is this which God has done to us?" (They blamed God). R. Jochanan raised his eyes to look at the child (because he was so

clever). The child's mother came and took him away. She said: Come away, that he may not do unto thee as he did to thy father. (He looked at Resh Lakish and the glance had proved fatal).

R. Jochanan said: Rain comes on account of one person (if he be righteous and needs it); support (prosperity) comes only on account of many. Rain comes for the sake of one, for it is written (Dt. 28:12): " The Lord will open for thee his good treasure-house to give the rain of thy land ". (The suffix of רַחֵם is singular). Support comes for the sake of many, for it is written (Ex. 16:4): " Behold, I will cause it to rain bread for you " (לחם is plural). *from a translation*

objection
The following controversy was raised in the academy: R. Jose said in the name of R. Judah: Three excellent leaders arose in Israel; Moses, Aaron and Miriam, and through them three excellent gifts were given: the well, the pillar of cloud and the manna. The well was given for Miriam's sake; the pillar of cloud for the sake of Aaron; the manna because of Moses. When Miriam died, the well was taken away, for it is said (Num. 20:1): " And Miriam died there ", and after it (Num. 20:2): " And there was no water for the community. " But for the sake of Aaron and Moses, the well was brought back. When Aaron died, the clouds of God's glory were removed, for it is said (Num. 21:1): " For the Canaanite the king of Arad heard. " What did he hear? He heard that Aaron was dead and that the clouds of God's glory were taken away; so he thought he was permitted to fight with Israel and this is the meaning of the verse (Num. 20:29): " And all the congregation saw that Aaron had perished. " *For a Babylonian commented upon this verse:*
Do not read וַיִּשְׁׁרְוּ (And they saw), but וַיִּשְׁׁרְוּ (And they

does not refer to the Rabbi
but means merely he was
made to dream of a curse,
a kind of prophetic
inspiration

feared), said R. Abbahu. ^{which is,} *(according to the statement of R. E. ...)*
~~for the~~ Further, we explain the verse ~~(according to the principle of Resh~~
~~Lakish), who taught thus:~~ ^{who said,} The word 'ו' may be used in four senses: (1)
 when, (2) perhaps, (3) but, (4) because. (Therefore the above verse is
 translated using 'ו' in the fourth sense: " And they feared because
 Aaron died ") Both gifts (the well and the cloud) were restored for
 the sake of Moses. When Moses died, all three gifts were taken away, for
 it is said (Zach. 11:8): " And I will destroy the three shepherds
 in one month". (It must refer to Moses, Aaron and Miriam for in no
 other period of history do three appear together). Did those three
 die in one month? Did not Miriam die in Nisan, Aaron in Ab and Moses
 in Adar? But the verse (Zach. 11:8): " And I will destroy the three
 shepherds in one month " teaches that the three precious gifts which
 were given for their sake were removed and all taken away in one
 month. (As a consequence of this opinion, R. Jochanan must be wrong
 when he says support only comes for the sake of many and not for one),
~~now do we not find here that~~ ~~for we find here~~ support given for the sake of one (Moses)? ^{No. for the} ~~The~~
 case of Moses is however, different; since his merit was as that of many,
 he was considered like many.

Rab Huna bar Manoah and Rab Samuel bar Idi and Rab Chija of
 Westanya came before Raba and after the latter died, they came before
 Rab Pappa. ^{for study} When Rab Pappa told them a tradition and it was not intel-
 ligible to them, they used to wink at each other (for Rab Pappa did
 not teach like Raba). Rab Pappa became disheartened. Then ^{he was} the Rabbis
 (folio 9 b) ^{shown} made him read in a dream the verse (Zach 11:8): " And

I will destroy the three shepherds in one month". (They felt regret for having annoyed him). On the morrow when the Rabbis departed from Rab Pappa, he said to them: May the Rabbis depart in peace (~~there are two readings~~ ~~אין שם~~ and ~~אין שם~~ here. *in the name*)

Rab Shimi bar Ashshe used to appear before Rab Pappa and dispute a great deal. One day Rab Shimi bar Ashshe saw Rab Pappa fall and heard him say: May God deliver me from being put to shame (through questions) by Shimi. Rab Shimi then vowed that he would be silent (and not argue any more).

Resh Lakish also was of the opinion that rain comes down for the sake of even one person, for it is written (Zach 10:1): " Ask of the Lord rain in the time of the late rain, from the Lord who maketh lightning-flashes; and he will give unto them showers of rain, to every herb in the field ". It might be supposed that he would not give rain unless all needed it; therefore Scripture says ~~אין שם~~ (even for the sake of one). Again it has been taught: But even if it comes for one man, one might suppose it must be necessary for all his fields; therefore Scripture says ~~אין שם~~ (even if it is needed for one field). One might also suppose that even if one field needs the rain, it must be needed by the whole field, therefore Scripture says ~~אין שם~~ (even if one herb requires the rain, it descends). This is like the opinion of Rab Daniel bar Kattina who had a garden. Every day he used to go and examine it. Each day he used to say: This bed needs water; this bed does not. Then came a rain which watered ^{every} every place that needed rain.

What is the meaning of the phrase (Zach. 10:1): " The Lord who

maketh lightning-flashes"? (Why is נ'ס'ס in the Plural)? This phrase teaches that for every righteous man, God makes in his presence a lightning-flash. What are נ'ס'ס ? Rab Judah said: eruptions. R. Jochanan said: Eruptions are a sign of rain. And what are eruptions? Rab Pappa said: A thin cloud under a thick one. Rab Judah said: If a sifted cloud comes before the rain (if it drizzles and then comes down heavily), then rain will continue (heavily for some time). But if a sifted cloud comes first and then a heavy rain, the rain will soon cease. The sign for the first case is a sieve (fine grain first, then coarse grain); the sign in the second case is the excrement of goats.

Ula came to Babylon and saw some eruptions (thin clouds under thick clouds). He said to the people: Remove the vessels for it is soon going to rain. When finally it did not rain, he said: Just as the Babylonians are faithless, so are their rains. Ula again came to Babylon where he saw a basketful of dates sold for a zuz (a quarter-shekel). He said: A basket-ful of honey (into which they make the dates) for a zuz and the Babylonians do not busy themselves with the Law. (They could do so continually for food was so cheap and so easily obtained). (He ate a great many). That night they brought on diarrhoea. He said: A basket-ful of knives for a zuz and yet the Babylonians busy themselves with the study of the Law.

It is taught: R. Eliezer says: All the earth drinks from the waters of the ocean (from the waters below and not above), for it is said (Gen. 2:6): " And a mist arose from the earth and watered the

face of the ground." But says R. Joshua to R. Eliezer: Are not the waters of the ocean salty? (How can they help the produce)? R. Eliezer answered: They become sweetened by the clouds. R. Joshua says: All the earth drinks from the waters above, for it is said (Dt. 11: 11): "From the rain of heaven doth it (the land) drink water." But if one holds the opinion of R. Joshua, how is one to understand the verse (Gen. 2: 6): "And a mist went up from the earth?" This verse teaches that the clouds swell and rise in the expanse, and open their mouths like a leather bottle and receive the waters of the rain, for it is said (Job 38: 27): "For he taketh away drops of water, which are distilled in his mist"; they (the clouds) are perforated like a sieve and distil water to the ground, for it is said (II. Sam. 22: 12): "The clouds of heaven cause the distilling of water."

Furthermore, between one drop of rain and another, there is only a hair's breadth, to teach thee that the day of rain is as important as the day on which heaven and earth were created, for it is said (Job 5: 9): "He doeth great things which are unsearchable" (רַק חַסֵּד) and it is written (Job 5: 10): "He it is who gives rain to the earth's surface." It is also written (Is. 40: 28): "Dost thou not know? hast thou not heard? God is the Eternal, Creator of the ends of the earth; he does not grow weary nor faint; unsearchable (רַק חַסֵּד) is his name." (There is here an analogy based on the word רַק חַסֵּד). Whom does the following opinion support? It is written (Ps. 104: 13): "He watereth the mountains from his upper-chambers." R. Jochanan thinks this means the upper-chambers of God. Whom does this support? It supports R. Joshua (who said: All the earth drinks from the waters above). But R. Eliezer might say: When

they have risen to heaven, then may one apply the verse (Ps. 104: 13): " He watereth the mountains from his upper-chambers ", For if you deny my proposition, how will you explain the verse (Dt. 28: 24): " Powder and dust, from heaven will it come down ". (These must have gone up from the earth and come down again.) But just as in the case of dust and fine dust, when they have risen, it is said: He sends them down from heaven, so with the waters, after they have gone up, it is said: " God waters the mountains from his upper-chambers ". Whom does the following opinion support? R. Chanina said regarding Ps. 33: 7 - " He gathereth together like heaps, the waters of the sea; he layeth up in storehouses the deeps. " Who caused the storehouses to be filled, if not the deeps? (The waters of the ocean bring up rain). This supports R. Eliezer, while R. Joshua (He does not refer this verse to the matter of water coming from above or below) (folio 10 a) applies this verse in reference to the creation of the world.

It is taught: Palestine was created first, and afterwards the rest of the world, for it is said (Prov. 8: 26): " While as yet, he had not made the land (Palestine) and the fields " (outside of Palestine). (The word $\gamma\tau\kappa$ stands before $\eta\iota\varsigma/\eta$.) God himself waters Palestine, while the rest of the world is watered by an angel, for it is said (Job. 5: 10): " He giveth rain upon the earth (Palestine), and sendeth water upon the fields " (outside of Palestine). (From $\eta\iota\varsigma/\eta$, is derived the idea of $\eta\iota\varsigma/\eta$, angel). Palestine receives the rain first and the rest of the world receives what is left, for it is said (Job 5: 10): " He gives rain upon the earth (Palestine) and sendeth water upon the

outside (of Palestine). (רשׁוּׁם , rain is mentioned with יִרְדּוּ , Palestine). Palestine receives the rain first and the rest of the world receives it later, for it is said (Job 5:10): " He giveth rain upon the earth (Palestine), and sendeth water upon the fields (outside of Palestine) (The word יִרְדּוּ stands before $\text{וְיִשְׁלַח$). This is like a man who forming a cheese, picks out the eatable part and leaves that which is not palatable.

Our text says (on the previous page): The waters of the ocean are sweetened by the clouds. How do we know this? R. Isaac bar Joseph said in the name of R. Jochanan: It is written (Ps. 18:12): " The dark waters, the dark clouds ", and it is written (2 Sam. 22:12): " The dark clouds, the distilling of water. " Take the Kaf (כ) of the word $\text{וְיִשְׁלַח$ and insert it before the Resh of וְיִרְדּוּ and read the word (from which one gets by analogy וְיִרְדּוּ). (The Rabbis frequently make an analogy based on the interchange of ר and כ). (וְיִרְדּוּ means sweetening of waters). But how would R. Joshua (who holds that the waters come from above) explain these verses? He might have the same opinion as may be gained from the following: When Rab Dimi came (to Babylon), he said: They say in the West (Palestine): If the clouds are bright, there will be little rain; if the clouds are dark, there will be much rain. (R. Joshua derives $\text{וְיִשְׁלַח$ from וְיִרְדּוּ , darkness and וְיִרְדּוּ from $\text{וְיִשְׁלַח$, to distil). Whom does the following Baraitha support? The upper waters are suspended by the word of God (are of no benefit) and their fruits are the waters of rain, for it is said (Ps. 104:13): " From the fruit of thy works, the earth shall be satisfied. " (There is

a kind of sweating of the heavens which are not distilled at all; the waters remain and the dripping is the rain). Whom does the above support? It supports R. Joshua (who holds that the rain comes from above). But how would R. Eliezer explain this verse? He would refer it to the other works of God.

R. Joshua ben Levi said: The whole world is watered from the remainder left by the Garden of Eden, for it is said (Gen. 2: 10): " And a river goes forth out of Eden to water the garden, and from there it parted, and became four streams ."

It is taught: An area requiring a khor of seed may be watered (from the contents of a vessel) and enough remain (in the vessel) to water an area requiring two kab of seed (one sixtieth of a khor).

Our Rabbis teach: Egypt is four hundred parasangs square and is one-sixtieth of Cush; Cush is one-sixtieth of the world; the world is one-sixtieth of the Garden; the Garden is one-sixtieth of Eden and Eden one-sixtieth of Gehinnom. Consequently, the whole world is as the lid of a pot in comparison with Gehinnom. There are some who say that both Gehinnom (hell) and Eden (heaven) are infinite.

R. Oshaya said: What is the meaning of the verse (Jer. 51: 13): " O thou that dwellest upon many waters, great in treasures ". This means to say: What is the reason that the treasure-houses (granaries) of Babylon are always filled? Must not one say it is because she dwells by many waters (בְּרַב־מַיִם for בְּרַב־מַיִם)? Rab said: Babylon is rich because she harvests without rain (does not need rain). Abaye said: We have received it by tradition, that flooded land is better

than rainless land.

Mishna: On the third day of Marchesvan, one begins to pray for rain; Rabban Gamaliel says: On the seventh day, fifteen days after the Feast of Booths, in order that the last pilgrim may reach the Euphrates. (The pilgrim who lives furthest away from Jerusalem can thus get home before the rain).

Gemara: R. Elazar said: The law is according to Rabban Gamaliel. (One begins to pray for rain on the seventh day of Marchesvan). It is taught: Chanina says: And in the exila, one does not begin to pray for rain until sixty days after the Tekupha (of Tishri, the autumnal equinox). Rab Huna said in the name of Samuel: The law is according to Chanina. (One begins sixty days after the Tekupha of Tishri). Is this true? Was it not asked of Samuel: When do we begin to say: " And give us dew and rain (the formula for praying for rain)? " And did he not answer: From the time when they bring up wood to the house of Tabuth, the hunter? Both opinions of Samuel ^{may} refer to one time (Sixty days after the autumnal equinox and the occasion for bringing up wood to be stored up for the winter's needs, refer to the same time). The question was raised, (When it is said one does not pray for rain until sixty days after the autumnal equinox, is the sixtieth day included (so that one does not say on it the prayer for rain), or is it excluded (so that one does say the prayer for rain on it). Come and hear: Rab said the sixtieth day is exclusive; Samuel said it is inclusive; Rab Nachman bar Isaac said: And thy sign is: Those on the heights (in Palestine) need water more than those in the lowlands. Therefore in

the land of Palestine, the sixtieth day is exclusive and one prays for rain on it). Those in the lowlands (in Babylon) do not need so much water. (Therefore in Babylon, the sixtieth day is inclusive and one does not pray for rain on it). Rab Pappa said: The law is that the sixtieth day is exclusive (and that one does pray for rain on it).

Mishna: When the seventeenth day of Marchesvan has arrived and the rain has not come down, the individuals (righteous men) begin to fast the three fasts. They eat and drink awaiting the night-fall and (on these fasts) they are permitted to work, to bathe, to anoint themselves, to put on their sandals and to cohabit. If the new moon of Kislev has come and the rain has not come down, the court decrees three fasts for the community. The people eat and drink awaiting the night-fall, and (on these fasts) they are permitted to work, to bathe, to anoint themselves, to put on their sandals and to cohabit.

Gemara: Who are to be understood by א'ר'ב' (individuals)? Rab Huna said: The Rabbis. And he furthermore said: The individuals fast three fasts, on Monday, Thursday and Monday. What new information does Rab Huna give, since this has already been said in the Mishna? The court does not decree a series of three fasts for the community and begin them on Thursday in order not to raise the price of provisions, but the first series of three fasts are on Monday, Thursday and Monday. What you might have supposed is that the Mishna refers to the public fasts, but not to those of the individuals, therefore Rab Huna informs us that this provision applies to the fasts of individuals. There is also a Baraitha to the same effect: When the individuals begin to fast, they

nor may everybody consider
~~but any person may consider~~
himself a ^{תלמיד} student, which is less
than a ^{חכם} scholar.

fast on Monday, Thursday and Monday, and they interrupt their fast on the New Moon and the holidays (folio 10 b) mentioned in *תענית* (a list of days commemorating great events on which no fast or funeral service was permitted.)

Our Rabbis teach: No one shall say: I am a scholar; I am not to be regarded as a *יחיד* (an individual; ^{personality, scholar} hence he need not begin to fast with the individuals), but all scholars are regarded as *יחידים* (individuals). Who is considered a *יחיד* (individual) and who a *חכם* (a scholar)? A *יחיד* is one who is fit to be appointed as a leader of the community, a *חכם* is one who, if asked a question of Halacha in his teaching, can answer, even if it be concerning Treatise Kallah, (a small treatise of the Talmud).

The Rabbis teach: Not everyone who desires to consider himself a *יחיד* ^{or even a scholar but might think} may do so. (He may act in a spirit of pride when he fasts); but any scholar may consider himself a *יחיד* (and fast; one does not apprehend that he fasts in a spirit of pride). The above is the opinion of R. Meir; R. Jose says: Any man (even if he is not a scholar) may consider himself a *יחיד* ^{or a scholar} and it will be regarded with favor, because it is not a matter of honor but one of pain.

It is taught in another Baraita: Not every one who wishes to consider himself a *יחיד* ^{or a scholar} may do so, but the scholar may. This is the opinion of R. Simeon ben Eliezer: Rab Simeon ben Gamaliel says: When is this the case? When it is a matter of honor, but when it is a matter of affliction, any one may consider himself a *יחיד* ^{or a scholar} and his action will be regarded with favor, for he gains no honor from it, only pain.

The Rabbis teach: If one fasts for a misfortune and that misfortune ceases, or if one fasts because of a sick person who gets well, the fasts must be finished. If one travels from a place where they do not fast, to a place where they are fasting, the traveler fasts with them. If one travels from a place where there is a fast, to a place where there is none, the traveler must keep on and finish his fasts (all the fasts which the people of his city have taken upon themselves). If he has forgotten he is fasting, and he eats and drinks, he shall not show himself before the community, nor must he indulge himself with delicacies, for it is said (Gen. 42:) : " And Jacob said to his sons: Why do you let yourselves be seen?" Jacob said to his sons: Do not show yourselves when you have plenty either before Esau or Ishmael (who are starving) in order that they shall not be envious of you.

It is written (Gen. 45:24): " Do not become agitated on the way". R. Elazar said: Joseph said to his brothers: Do not busy yourselves with a question of Halacha, lest the road become unsteady for you (lest you lose your way). Is this true? Did not R. Ilai bar Berechya say: If two scholars are traveling together and do not converse on the Law, they ought to be burned? for it is said (2 K. 2:11): " And it came to pass while they were walking on and conversing, behold, a chariot of fire and horsemen of fire and parted them both asunder." They were saved because they were engaged in conversation; if there had been no conversation, they ought to have been burned. There is no contradiction (between R. Elazar who said: Joseph said to his brothers etc., and R.

A which may be caused by too much motion

A since the passenger is resting

Ilai bar Berechya). In the one case (Joseph's brothers), the prohibition refers to repeating traditions by heart; in the other case, to speculation (which is never interrupted).

It is taught: Do not take large steps and bring the sun into the city. Do not take large steps, for it is said: A large step takes one five hundredth part from man's sight. And bring the sun into the city; this teaching is according to Rab Judah, who said in the name of Rab; A man should always go out (of the city) with א/ו' (he should wait until it is light; א/ו' refers to light according to Gen. 1:4), and he should always enter the city with א/ו' (while it is yet light in the evening), for it is said (Gen. 44:3): " The morning dawned and the men were sent away . "

Rab Judah said in the name of R. Chiya: If a man goes on a journey, he should not eat more than in the years of famine. What is the reason? Here (in Babylon) they say it is because of diarrhoea; In Palestine they say it is because of (lack of) food. What practical difference is there between these two opinions? There is this difference: the case of one who travels (folio 11 a) on a ship (One eats sparingly because of scarcity of food, not from fear of diarrhoea), or the case of one traveling from one lodging-place to another (One eats sparingly from fear of diarrhoea, not because of scarcity of food).

Rab Pappa used to eat a morsel of bread at every parasang he walked, though he was of the opinion that one should eat sparingly on a journey, because of fear of diarrhoea. (However, he was a stout man and was not afraid). Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: Every one

who undergoes privations in the years of famine is spared an unnatural death (by famine ,sword etc.);for it is said (Job.5:20): " In famine he redeemeth thee from death." (If this were not the meaning), the text should read *מִפְּנֵי* (from famine) instead of *בְּפִנְיָא* (in famine). What is really meant by this verse is that because he has undergone privations in the years of famine, he will be spared an unnatural death. *(מִפְּנֵי means then on account of keeping himself hungry)*.

Resh Lakish said: One is forbidden to cohabit in the years of famine, for it is said (Gen.41:50): " And there was born to Joseph two sons before the year of famine came ." It is taught: They who are childless may cohabit in the years of famine.

Our Rabbis teach: In the time when Israel is in affliction and a man withdraw himself from the community, his two guardian angels come and lay their hands upon his head and say: This man has isolated himself from the community; let him not see its prosperity. It is taught in another Baraitha: In the time when the community is in trouble, let no man say: I will go to my house and eat and drink and say: Peace be unto thee, O my soul; for if he doeth thus, of him Scripture says (Is. 22:13): " And behold, gladness and joy, slaying of oxen and killing of sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine; Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die ." What follows in the text ? (Is. 22:14): " And it was revealed in my ears by the Lord of hosts (as follows): Surely this iniquity shall not be forgiven you until you die ." This is the temperament of the average man (for he at least fears death), but regarding the temperament of the wicked, how is it? It is written (Is. 53:12):

see Psalms: "not suffering with the community,
does not act to the righteous but
to the wicked and the righteous
perishes in order that he might not
be afflicted by the afflictions of the
wicked or that he might not
pray to God for them."

" Come ye, I will bring wine, and let us swallow abundantly of strong drink, and like this day shall the morrow be." What follows in the text ? (Is. 57:1): " The righteous man perishes and no man layeth it to heart for on account of the evil is the righteous man taken away. (On account of what evil? On account of not suffering with the community).

Wrong

But everybody
~~And even the very righteous~~ ought to suffer privations with the community, for thus we find in the case of Moses, our teacher who endured privations with the people, for it is said (Ex. 17:12): " And when the hands of Moses became heavy, then they took a stone and put it under him and he sat thereon." But did not Moses have a pillow or a cushion on which to sit? Yes, but he thought: Inasmuch as Israel is in distress, I will share their distress. And every one who suffers privations with the community, deserves to live to see the prosperity of the community.

Perhaps a man may say: Who will testify against me (if I hold aloof from the community)? The stones and the beams of a man's house will testify against him, for it is said (Hab. 2:11): " For the stone will cry out of the wall, and the wooden girders will answer it." The school of R. Shila says: The two guardian angels of man will testify against him, for it is said (Ps. 91:11): " For he gives his angels charge over thee to guard thee in all thy ways." R. Chidka says: The soul of man will testify against him, for it is said (Mic. 7:5): " She that lieth in thy bosom, guard against her the doors of thy mouth." And there are those who say that the *limbs* bones of man will testify

And, according to the version 10601,
"take leave from him".

against him, for it is said (Is. 43:10): " Ye are my witnesses; saith the Lord." (The plural is used).

What is the meaning of the verse (Dt. 32:4): " The God of truth without iniquity "? The meaning of " the God of truth " is: Just as the wicked are punished in the world to come, for even the slightest transgression which they do here, so in this world the righteous are punished even for the slightest transgression which they commit. The meaning of "(the God)without iniquity " is: Just as the righteous are rewarded in the world to come for even the slightest good deed which they do (in this world), so the wicked are rewarded in this world for even the slightest good deed which they do. (Dt. 32:4): " Righteous and upright is he ". This teaches that at the moment when a man is removed to the cemetery, all his deeds are explicitly stated, in his presence and the statement is made to him: So and so have you done in such and such a place, at such and such a time, and he answers, Yes! Then he is told to sign and he does so, for it is said (Job 37:7): " He maketh a man put his signature to all his deeds." And not only this, but the individual acknowledges the justice of the verdict passed upon him and says: You have judged me rightly, to fulfill what is said (Ps. 51:6): " In order that God may be justified by thy words."

Samuel said: Any one who fasts should be called a sinner. He is of the same opinion as that Tanna who teaches: R. Elazar Hakkappara, son of Rabbi says: It is written (Num. 6:11): " And he (the priest) shall make an atonement for him (the Nazarite) because he hath sinned against the soul."

Against whose soul did he sin if not (his own) in that he abstained from wine ? And from this opinion may we not make an inference a fortiori ? For if who who abstains only from wine is called a sinner, then one who abstains from many things (by fasting), ought certainly to be called a sinner. R. Elazar says: Any one who fasts is called a saint, for it is said (Num. 6:5): " He shall be holy, letting grow untouched the hair of his head." By an inference a fortiori, we concluded that if one who abstains only from one thing (wine) is regarded as a saint, then one who abstains from many things (by fasting), ought certainly to be considered a saint. Samuel might still hold that the Nazarite is a sinner, but that ω/π refers to his letting his hair grow long. Elazar might also hold to his original opinion, that the Nazarite is a saint, but that he is called a sinner when he has defiled himself by contact with a corpse.

But did R. Elazar say that one who fasts is considered a saint)? Does he not say: A man should always conduct himself (folio 11 b) as if there was something holy in his inwards, for it is said (Hos. 11:9): " Within thee is something holy." (Because this something holy is in distress) therefore I will not come into the city). But R. Elazar does not contradict himself. In one case he thinks that one who is able to fast and does so, is called holy; in the other case, he who is not able to fast and yet does so (He is called a sinner) is meant. Resh Lakish said: He who fasts is called a saint, for it is said (Prov. 11:17): " He who weans his soul (abstains from food and drink) is a saintly man, but he who troubles his flesh is a cruel man." Rab

By the insertion of the word ṭm the author seems to believe that it has here the same meaning as above, where it was contrasted with ṭm. Here ṭm means merely an individual, any man not exactly a scholar contrasting a ṭm, community.

Shesheth said: As for that student in the school of Rab who fasts, may some dog eat his meal. *i. e. This is the whole benefit of it.*

R. Jeremiah bar Abba said: There is in Babylon no public fast except the ninth of Ab (on all other fast days the rigorous prohibitions connected with fast-days are neglected).

Rab Jeremiah bar Abba said (also), in the name of Resh Lakish: A scholar should not fast, for he reduces the work of God. (He is weak and cannot learn).

Mishna: When the seventeenth day of Marchesvan has arrived, and the rain has not come down, the individuals (righteous men) begin to fast the three fasts. They eat and drink awaiting the night-fall etc.

Gemara: R. Zeera said in the name of Rab Huna: An individual *X* (777) who vows a fast (who the day before says: I will fast tomorrow), even if he eats and drinks the whole night (until dawn), on the morrow he must say the prayer for a fast, (777). If he remained in his fast over night (in that fast which he had vowed and does not eat anything all night), he may not say the prayer for a fast until he has eaten something to fulfill his duty as regards the fast of the night). Rab Joseph said: Why does Rab Huna think that one should not say the prayer for a fast (if he has fasted all night according to the above instance)? Is Rab Huna of the opinion that one may not fast for a few hours (when one intends to fast a few hours and fasts longer), or that one may fast for a few hours, but in such a case, one must not say the prayer for a fast? Abaye answered Rab Joseph: Rab Huna certainly believed that one might fast for a few hours, and that one who fasted

for a few hours must say the prayer for a fast, but in this instance it is different(The man did not the day before, vow to fast during the night, but only during the day following.), for he fasted during the hours of the night which he had not in the first place included in his vow).

Mar Ukba happened to come to Ginzak. The people asked him the following questions: May one fast for a few hours or not? He could not answer; Are the earthen vessels of the gentiles (in which they bring wine for preservation) to be used or not? He could not answer: In what clothes did Moses serve during the seven days of the inauguration?(Reference is made to the ordination of Aaron, Lev. Ch. 8. Of Aaron it is said, he wore the garments of the priesthood, but nothing is said of Moses; it is hardly to be supposed he wore his every-day clothes). Nor could Mar Ukba answer this question. He went and raised these questions in the academy. The answers were given as follows: The rule is that one may fast for a few hours and must say the prayer relating to a fast; the rule is (regarding the second question) that the earthen vessels (of the gentiles) may after twelve months be used (without cleansing them with water); the answer - (to the third question) is that during the entire seven days of inauguration, Moses was clad in a white shirt (of linen); Rab Kahana teaches that Moses wore during this time a white shirt which had no border.

Rab Chasda said: What (folio 12 a) has been said, that one may fast for a few hours (and he who does so prays *וְיָבִין*) refers only to the instance when one eats nothing until evening. But Abaye said: Such

a fast is certainly a valid (complete) fast. (When one has vowed to fast until noon and then fasts the whole day; this however, contradicts the opinion of Rab Huna that one may fast a few hours and it is a valid fast). Is not this statement of Rab Chasda superfluous? No! this statement is necessary for it refers to the case of one who changes his mind. (The case of one who had not vowed to fast at all, but was too busy to eat until noon, so he then decides to fast the whole day).

Rab Chasda furthermore said: Any fast on which the sun does not set (if one has not fasted until sun-set) should not be considered a fast. To contradict this the members of the academy quoted a higher authority (the Mishna) : The men of the guard (Priests and Levites who do duty in the Temple) begin to fast but do not finish their fast. (They do not fast until night because they are busy with the service, yet their abstinence is called a fast). The men of the guard fast merely to afflict themselves (with the community, not because of an obligation which they have vowed, hence they can eat whenever they please). But come and listen to this (which contradicts Rab Chasda's opinion that if one does not fast until night, it is no fast).

Rab Elazar ben Zadok said: I am one of the grand-sons of Senaah ben Benjamin, and once the ninth of Ab happened to fall on Sabbath and they postponed it to Sunday; we fasted on that day, but did not finish our fast because it was a holiday (the day when this man's family had to deliver wood for the Temple service). In this case also (they do not fast because of an obligation which they have vowed), but merely to trouble themselves with the community. Come then and listen to the

following(which contradicts Rab Chasda's opinion):Rab Jochanan said: I will fast until I come home.(He did this often,and if he came home at the second or third hour,he used to eat,yet he called it a fast). Rab Jochanan acted thus only because he wanted to be excused from dining with the Nasi(not because he had vowed to fast).

Samuel said:Any fast which is not vowed in the day-time,should not be considered a fast. If a man fasts (without having vowed his fast in the day-time),what about such a fast? Raba bar Shila said:Such a fast is like a bellows which is full of wind.(So is one who fasts without vowing his fast in the day-time,filled with wind,for he has abstained from food for no purpose).

When should one take upon himself the vow to fast? Rab said:At the time of the afternoon-prayer.(Even if one is in the street,he must say the formula). Samuel said:In the afternoon-prayer (for it is nearest his fast day). Rab Joseph said: The law is evidently like Samuel, for it is written in Megillath Ta'anith (a list of the holidays on which one does not fast): " These are the days on which one must not fast,therefore every man who has taken upon himself a series of fasts before these holidays,is bound (אֵינוֹ מְצֻיָּא). What does this mean? Does it not mean that he shall vow (a fast) in his prayer (which agrees with Samuel)? No! it means that he is bound to fast (even on those holidays mentioned).

R. Chiya and R. Simeon bar Rabbi differ on this point. One said:He shall vow a fast in his prayer,and the other said:He is bound to fast. According to him who says: He shall vow a fast in his prayer,it is

See above p. 676

intelligible for we have learned: (If one has taken upon himself a vow in the afternoon prayer to fast, he may fast, otherwise he may not). But how about the one who says: He is bound to fast (if the fast comes upon any one of these holidays, disregarding the matter of the afternoon prayer)? He bases his opinion on Megillath Taanith. Every man who vows a series of fasts before these holy days, must keep his vow (and fast on the days which are mentioned in Megillath Taanith). How is this? An individual (~~who~~) who vows to fast every Monday and Thursday throughout the year, (and those days mentioned in Megillath Taanith happen to conflict with them, Monday and Thursday), if he has made his vow before our decree (before the Rabbis have appointed these holidays), his vow annuls our decree (He may fast), but if our decree is made before his vow, the former annuls the latter (He may not fast on these holidays).

Our Rabbis teach: How long may one eat and drink (during the night preceding a fast? Here reference is made to the fast of the individual). Until dawn, according to Rabbi; Eliezer bar Simeon says: Until the cock crows ^{even if the cock crows} ~~(even once)~~. Abaye said: The Rabbis only teach these limits provided that a person has not finished his meal, but if he has done this, all agree that he must not eat. In objection to this statement, Raba had a tradition that even if one has arisen from the table, he may (sit down again and)eat. This refers to a case, when the food has not been removed from the table. According to another version, Raba said: The Rabbis only teach these limits provided a person has not fallen asleep, but if he has fallen asleep, he must not eat. In objection to

this statement, Abaye said: Even if one falls asleep and awakens, he may eat. This refers to the case of one who merely dozes. What is meant by dozing? Rab Ashshe said: A sleep (folio 12 a) which is no sleep, a wakefulness which is no wakefulness. When a person ^{calls him} is called, he answers, but does not know how to answer intelligently; however when ^{was told} ~~later~~ he is reminded of what he ~~said~~, he remembers.

X
Wrong
Rab Kahana said in the name of Rab: An individual who takes upon himself a fast (without specifying whether he does it as an individual or with the community), is forbidden to put on his sandals, for we apprehend that he may have vowed a public fast. What shall he do? Raba bar Rab Shila said: Let him say the following formula (in his vow to fast): Tomorrow will I fast as an individual. The Rabbis said to Rab Shesheth: We have seen Rabbis who come to the fast-meeting with their sandals on. Rab Shesheth got angry and said to them: Perhaps they also eat (at these times).

Abaye and Raba were journeying, having put on appantas, (a kind of legging fastened to the shoe) on a public fast-day. Meremar and Mar Zutra wore their sandals on the wrong feet (on a fast-day); the right sandal on the left foot and the left sandal on the right foot. The Rabbis of the academy of Rab Ashshe used to go about like ~~travel-~~
Wrong
ers. (On a fast-day they wore their sandals). They were of the same opinion as Samuel who said: There is no public fast in Babylon except on the ninth of Ab.

Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: A man may borrow his fast and pay. (He may eat during the time he has vowed to fast and fast some

Samuel objects to the statement that he
has to fast another day by saying:

why should he fast another
day? did he take a vow upon
himself? No, he merely intended
to afflict himself on a certain
day. Now, if it is able to do so on
that day he may do so,
if not he need not do so
and is not obliged to fast
on another day.

The other version, in which the
opposite opinion is stated, in
the name of Samuel, has
then a proper sense.

other day). When I repeated this opinion to Samuel, he said to me: When a man has taken upon himself a vow, he must pay. He has vowed to afflict himself (to fast); if he is able to afflict himself, he must do so, if he is unable, he need not do so. (~~He may fast on another day~~). According to another version, Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: A man may borrow his fast and pay. When I repeated this opinion to Samuel he said to me: This is plain for it is simply a vow; if one does not wish to pay a vow (on the proper day), one may postpone its payment to the following or any other day.

Rab Joshua, the son of Rab Idi came to the house of Rab Assi; they prepared for him a three-year old calf and said to him: Please eat something. Rab Joshua answered: I am fasting. At this they said to him: Borrow and then pay back. (Postpone your fast to some other day.) Do you not hold the opinion of Rab Judah, who said in the name of Rab: A man may borrow his fast and pay it back? Rab Joshua answered: I am fasting for a dream and Rabba bar Mehasya said in the name of Rab Chama bar Gorya in the name of Rab: A fast is as effective for a dream (to counteract it) as fire for chips. And Rab Chasda said: One must fast on the same day (as the dream), while according to Rab Joseph: One must fast even on the Sabbath. What amends shall one then make (for fasting on Sabbath)? He must fast some other day for having fasted.

Mishna: When these have passed (the three fasts of the community), and they have not been answered, the court decrees three other fasts for the whole community. The people eat and drink during the day-time (before sun-set) of the preceding day. It is forbidden to work, to bathe,

to anoint, to wear sandals and to cohabit and the bath-houses are closed. If these three fasts pass without being answered, the court decrees seven additional fasts upon the community, making in all thirteen public fasts.

The only difference between the first (six) fasts and the last (seven) is that on the latter, the alarm is sounded and the shops are closed. On Monday shortly before sunset the doors are left ajar; on Thursday they are kept open in honor of the Sabbath. If these (seven) fasts pass without being answered, one lessens one's efforts to some extent in business, in building, in planting, in the preparations connected with an engagement or marriage, one greets another a little less demonstratively, acting like men reproved by God. The individuals (ע'ג'ר') again begin to fast and continue till the end of Nisan. When Nisan is passed and the rains have not come down, it is a sign of a curse, for it is said (1. Sam. 12:17) "Is it not wheat-harvest to-day? I will call unto the Lord and he will send thunders and rain"

Gemara: It is right that all those things which are pleasures, such as bathing, anointing and cohabitation (should be forbidden), but work is pain. (Why is it prohibited?) Rab Chasia said in the name of R. Jeremiah bar Abba: Scripture says (Joel 1:14): "Sanctify a fast, proclaim a solemn assembly, gather the elders". The fast-day is like the holiday (עצרה). Just as work is prohibited on a holiday, so is it also prohibited on a fast-day. (In Joel ח'ט and עצרה are mentioned together.) If your analogy is correct, then just as work is prohibited during the night of a holiday, so ought it also to be pro-

of the ^{the feeling} public and
does not refer to Joel 119

hibited during the night of a fast. R. Zera said: It was explained to me by Rab Jeremiah bar Abba: Scripture said: (Joel 1:14): "Gather the elders." One may make an analogy on the basis of the assembly of elders. As the assembly of elders occurs in the day-time (for at night, each is in his own home), so also does the fast occur in the day-time. If you make this analogy, then I would say that just as the assembly of elders is at noon, so should the fast begin at noon. Rab Shisha, *Mr!* son of Rab Idi said: That the assembly of elders is in day-time, supports Rab Huna who said: The assembly is in the morning. (On a public fast-day they are assembled in the house of assembly in the morning.)

What are the proceedings (when the community assembles in the morning and fasts the whole day)? Abaye said: From morning until noon, they consider communal affairs (if there is any violence or theft); from noon on for a fourth part of the day (From noon till night, the time is divided into two parts), they read from the Pentateuch and have the additional reading from the Prophets. During the last quarter of the day, they pray to God, for it is said (Neh. 9:3): "And they stood up in their place, and read in the Book of the Law of the Lord, their God, the fourth part of the day; and another fourth part they made confession and prostrated themselves before the Lord, their God." I might say (folio 13 a) that the order is reversed (Bible readings and prayer the first half of the day, and the consideration of communal affairs afterwards). Let this not enter your mind, for it is written (Ez. 9:4): "And then there assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the trespass of the

exiles. ";it is also written (Ez.9:5):" And at the evening sacrifice I rose from my fasting. and I spread out my hands unto the Lord, my God." (From these verses we conclude that they prayed and fasted in the afternoon).

Raphram bar Pappa said in the name of Rab Chasda: On every fast which is decreed for the sake of mourning, as for example, the fast on the ninth of Ab (mourning for the destruction of the Temple), or the fast of a mourner for his dead, it is forbidden to bathe either in hot or cold water. On any fast-day which is decreed in order to diminish pleasure, as for example, a fast of the community, it is forbidden to bathe in hot water, but permitted in cold. Rab Idi bar Abbin said: We might have inferred this too from the Mishna (that it is forbidden to bathe in hot water), for the Mishna says (regarding a public fast): And the bath-houses (which are of hot water) are closed. (We might also have inferred that though hot water is forbidden, cold is permitted.) Abaye answered: (No! your inference is not valid for) how could the Tanna say in regard to the prohibition of cold water: The rivers should be closed? (This is impossible). Rab Shisha, son of Rab Idi said: My father found this difficulty: Since the Mishna says: It is forbidden to bathe, why does it add: The bath-houses are closed? (From the first expression we infer that both hot and cold water are forbidden; from the second expression only hot water is forbidden. ^{may therefore} May we not infer that though one must not bathe in hot water, one may do so in cold?)

Shall we say that the following statement supports Rab Chasda (He says: On every fast which is decreed for the sake of mourning it is

forbidden to bathe both in hot and cold water); All who are obliged to take an immersion (a woman during menstruation or after confinement) bathe in the proper way whether it be the ninth of Ab or the Day of Repentance. In what water (hot or cold)? How can we say it is in hot water? There is no immersion in hot water for it is drawn (and therefore unfit for immersion). But must we not conclude that the immersion is in cold water? In the case of those who are bound to take an immersion, yes; in the case of others, no! (They cannot bathe either in hot or cold water). Rab Chana bar Kattina said: This only refers to the hot springs of Tiberias. (Therefore those who are to take an immersion may bathe in them, others may not, but cold water is permitted to all.) If this is true, let us hear the other clause: Chanina, chief of the priests said: The Temple is deserving of our giving up a bath once a year. If it is as you say, that one may bathe in cold water, let him do so (Why should it be said that one should forego a bath once a year for the sake of the Temple)? Must we not then conclude that one who is bound to take an immersion may not, even for the sake of the Temple, take it in hot water, while others must not bathe at all. Rab Pappa said: (I still maintain this refers to the hot springs of Tiberias. Hence those who are bound to take an immersion may do so, others may not, but all are permitted to bathe in cold water). The meaning of R. Chanina's statement that one may omit a bath for the sake of the Temple, refers to a place where there is no cold water.

Come and hear! Whenever the Rabbis say: It is forbidden to work, they refer only to the day but not to the night; when they say it is

forbidden to wear sandals, they refer to being in a city, but not when traveling (outside the city). How do they carry this out? When they start on the way, they put on their sandals; on entering a city, these are removed. And when it is forbidden to bathe, the prohibition refers only to the whole body, but one is allowed to bathe one's face, hands and feet; the same is the case with him who has been excommunicated and with a mourner. What is meant by the statement: The same is the case with one excommunicated and with a mourner? May one not conclude that it refers to the three statements above which would include bathing? What water is to be considered? Shall we say: One is permitted to bathe one's face, hands and feet in hot water? Did not Rab Shesheth say: One is forbidden to dip even a finger in hot water? (From this we could infer that one is forbidden to bathe one's whole body in cold water also). Must we not conclude that the statement refers to cold water? No! I still maintain it refers to hot water, and that which you find difficult in the expression: The same is the case with one excommunicated and with a mourner, refers to the other prohibitions (sandals and anointing), not to bathing. (I still maintain that in hot water one may bathe face, hands and feet, but in cold water, one may bathe the whole body).

Come and hear! R. Abba, the Priest said in the name of R. Jose, the Priest: It happened once that the two sons of R. Jose bar Chanina died, and he bathed in cold water during the entire seven days of mourning. (Consequently we infer that a mourner may bathe in cold water). This was a case when his periods of mourning came in succession, for

it is taught: If a man has two periods of mourning in succession, and his hair becomes too heavy on him, he may lighten it with a knife, and he may wash his clothes with water. Rab Chasda said: He may lighten his hair with a knife, but not with a scissors; he may wash his clothes with water, but not with soap (carbonate of soda) or sand. Raba said: One is permitted to wash in cold water all seven days of mourning, for this affords as much relief as meat and drink.

At the academy the following was brought in contradiction (folio 13b): A girl beginning maturity (at the age of twelve years and six months) is not allowed to disfigure herself at the time of mourning for her father; a girl not yet matured (from twelve to twelve and one half years) may do so. To what does this refer? Does it not refer to bathing? If so, in what water may she bathe? Shall we say that the statement as to a girl of maturity not being allowed to disfigure herself means that she may bathe in hot water? No! for did not Rab Chasda say: A mourner is forbidden to dip even a finger in hot water? Must it then not be that a girl of maturity may bathe in cold water? No! there is in this no reference to bathing, but to dyeing the hair and painting the eye-lids.

Shall we say that the following offers any evidence? Rab Abba the Priest said in the name of R. Jose, the Priest: It happened once that the two sons of R. Jose bar Chanina died and he bathed in cold water during the entire seven days of mourning. (Consequently we infer that a mourner may bathe in cold water). But it may be said: This was a case when his periods of mourning came in succession, for it is

taught: If a man has two periods of mourning in succession and his hair becomes too heavy on him, he may lighten it with a knife and may wash his clothes with water. Rab Chasda said: He may lighten his hair with a knife, but not with a scissors; he may wash his clothes with water, but not with soap or sand or mineral substance. Another version has it that Raba said: A mourner is forbidden to bathe in cold water during the entire seven days of his mourning. How does this differ from a case of meat and food (for Raba said before, it was permitted to bathe in cold water)? In the former case it was permitted, to offset the effect of the mourner's grief.

Shall I say that the following offers any evidence? A girl beginning maturity is not allowed to disfigure herself at the time of mourning for her father; a girl not yet matured may do so. (Does not this refer to bathing)? If so, in what water may she bathe? Shall we say that the statement as to a girl of maturity not being allowed to disfigure herself means that she may bathe in hot water? No! for did not Rab Chasda say: A mourner is forbidden to dip even a finger in hot water? Must it not be that a girl of maturity may bathe in cold water? No! there is in this no reference to bathing but to dyeing the hair and painting the eye-brows.

Rab Chasda said: This teaches that from this special case, the general principle is deduced that a mourner is forbidden to wash during the entire seven days of mourning. This is the rule: A mourner is forbidden to bathe his whole body both in hot and cold water during the entire seven days of mourning, but face, hands and feet, he is forbid-

den to bathe in hot water, but permitted in cold. However to anoint his body even the least bit is forbidden, unless it be to remove the dirt.

When do we mention the prayer for a fast (/ J J)? Rab Judah took his son Rab Isaac and taught as follows: an individual who has vowed a fast must say a prayer in connection with the fast. Where does he say it? Between the blessing which treats of redemption and that which treats of healing (the seventh and eighth of the "Eighteen Benedictions"). Rab Isaac objected to this saying: Can an individual establish a blessing for himself? Rab Isaac thought the fast-prayer should be inserted in the blessing which treats of God hearing prayer (the fifteenth of the original "Eighteen Benedictions"), and Rab Shesheth was of the same opinion. The objection was raised among the Rabbis: There is no difference between the individual and the community (as to a fast) except that the former prays eighteen benedictions (The fast-prayer is included in the fifteenth benediction) and the latter prays nineteen. (The fast-prayer is inserted between the seventh and eighth benedictions).

What is to be understood by individual, and what by community? Shall I say the term individual (7' H) means a single person and community (7' J) means the deputy of the congregation? How then could it be said that there are nineteen benedictions which the deputy reads? Do we not read in the Mishna (Taanith 16a): The deputy of the congregation says twenty-four benedictions on the fast-day? But must one not conclude the following: There is no difference between an

See my answer to p. 95.

an individual who takes upon himself the fast of an individual and an individual who takes upon himself a public fast, except that in the former instance he prays eighteen and in the latter, nineteen benedictions? From this one may infer that an individual can establish a blessing for himself. No! this inference is not valid, I still claim that by individual is meant a single person and by community, the deputy of the congregation, that which you find difficult—that the deputy of the congregation prays twenty-four benedictions—does not refer to the first three fasts, for on them there are no twenty-four benedictions. And is it true that there are ^{one} twenty-four benedictions on the first three fasts? Does not the Mishna in teaching the differences expressly say: There is no difference between the first three fasts and the middle three except that on the first three, work is permitted, while on the middle three, it is forbidden. Consequently it may be inferred that as regards the twenty-four benedictions, both sets of fasts are alike.

(There may be other differences). Here the Mishna only teaches certain differences and omits others. But what else did the Mishna omit so as to be justified in omitting this? And furthermore, the Mishna teaches expressly that there is no other difference. In answer I may say: The Mishna is here speaking about prohibitions, not about prayers. And if you wish, I may even say that on the middle fasts likewise, one does not pray the twenty-four benedictions. Is it true that there are not twenty-four benedictions on the middle three fasts? Is it not taught: There is no difference between the second three fasts

and the last seven, except that on the latter the alarm is given and the shops are closed. Consequently it may be inferred that in all other things they are alike. But should you say that here too the Mishna teaches certain differences and omits others (the difference as to prayer), then I would say it is expressly taught that there is no other difference. (Both therefore, have the twenty-four benedictions).

In answer it may be said: How can you hold the opinion that the expression "there is no difference" is to be taken literally? (folio 14 a) Does not the Mishna omit the fact of the ark being brought out into the street (which is done only on the last seven fasts)? If you maintain the expression "there is no difference" is not to be taken literally because the carrying out of the ark is not mentioned, I may say that this is no omission, for the Mishna is teaching about the things done privately (the sounding of the alarm and the reading of prayers in the synagog), not those done publicly (the ark being carried into the street of the city).

Rab Ashshe said: That both the middle three and the last seven fasts are alike in regard to the twenty-four benedictions, is also proved by a conclusion from the expression used in the following Mishna (Ta'anith 12 b): The only difference between the first (six) fasts and the last (seven) is that on the latter the alarm is sounded and the shops are closed, consequently in all other things they are alike. But should you say that here too the Mishna teaches certain differences and omits others, then I would say it is expressly taught

very
good

that there is no other difference.

In answer it may be said: How can you hold the opinion that the expression "there is no difference" is to be taken literally? Does not the Mishna omit the fact of the ark being brought out into the street? (This is done on the last seven fasts only). If you maintain that the expression "there is no difference" is not to be taken literally, because the carrying out the ark is not mentioned, I may say that this is no omission, for it is treated of in another (the second) chapter. Now that you come to this opinion (that the fact of the ark being carried out is not an omission, since it is treated elsewhere), I may also say that the fact of the difference in the number of blessings, is also not omitted for it is also taught in the second chapter.

What is the conclusion? (Where does the individual say the fast-prayer)? Rab Samuel bar Sasratai said, as did Rab Chiya bar Ashshe in the name of Rab: Between the benediction treating of redemption and that of healing (the seventh and eighth). But Rab Ashshe said in the name of R. Jannai, son of R. Ishmael: In the benediction treating of God hearing prayer (the fifteenth of the original "Eighteen Benedictions"). The rule is according to the latter opinion.

One Baraitha teaches: Pregnant women and wet nurses fast on the first set of fasts, but not on the last; another Baraitha teaches: They fast on the last set of fasts, but not on the first; still a third Baraitha teaches: They fast neither on the first nor on the last. Rab Ashshe said: If you conclude that they fast on the middle fast-days, then the three Baraithas will not contradict each other. (In the first

with what instrument

X read: a certain passage beginning
V'v'v' (not that which is regularly prayed on
every festival) is shouted in a loud voice
see Rashi and Tosafoth ad locum.

Baraitha, by first fasts is meant the first from the last, the middle fasts; in the second Baraitha, by last is meant those after the first, the middle fasts).

Mishna: The only difference between the first (six) fasts and the last (seven) is that on the latter the alarm is sounded and the shops are closed.

Gemara: How is the alarm sounded? Rab Judah said: With the cornet. But Rab Judah, son of Rab Samuel bar Shilath, said in the name of Rab:

X The /J'J'Y is shouted in a loud voice. Do you think that he who says that the alarm is sounded with the /J'J'Y does not think it is also by the cornet, and he who says it is sounded by the cornet, does not also think it is done with the /J'J'Y? Is it not taught: They do not decree (referring to the last fasts) less than seven fasts on the community, and on them there are eighteen soundings of the alarm; the sign for this is Jericho, for at Jericho the cornet was sounded. This is then a refutation for him who would say: The alarm is only sounded with the /J'J'Y. This is true, but when the alarm is sounded by the cornet, no one denies that it is called a sounding of the alarm; they differ as to whether the sounding of the alarm with the /J'J'Y is also called a sounding of the alarm. One thinks it is and one thinks it is not. According to him who says that if the alarm is sounded with the /J'J'Y it is called a sounding of the alarm, we infer that if it be sounded by the cornets, it should surely be called a sounding of the alarm; and according to him who says that if the alarm is sounded with the cornets, it is called a sounding of the alarm, we ^{cannot} infer that if it is

sounded with the ^{also} ~~not~~ ^{also}, it is ~~not~~ so called.

But is it not taught: Over all the other calamities which break forth, such as scab, locusts, flies, hornets, gnats or over-running of the land by snakes or scorpions, they do not sound the alarm, but cry aloud? Consequently it may be inferred, since crying is with the mouth, sounding the alarm must be with the cornets. (Making a noise with the mouth is therefore not called sounding an alarm). There are here two different opinions of two Tannaim, for we learn in the Mishna: Over the following is the alarm sounded on Sabbath: over a city besieged by invaders, a river overflowing its banks and a ship dismantled at sea. R. Jose said: Here it is meant that they cry for aid, not that they pray concerning these calamities. How then did they cry for aid? Should I say: It was done with the cornets? No! for the cornet cannot be blown on the Sabbath. Must I not conclude it was with the ^{also} and such action is called sounding of the alarm? This concludes the matter. (We see the Tannaim differ on the subject).

In the time of R. Judah the Prince, there came a plague (folio 14b). He instituted thirteen fasts but they were not answered. He intended to institute more, but R. Ami said: The Rabbis said that one must not trouble the community ^{too much} ~~more than what is sufficient~~. R. Abba, son of R. Chiya bar Abba said: When R. Ami did this (said that one must not trouble the community too much), it was for his own sake. (He did not wish to fast any more). ^{Therefore said} ~~But this is what~~ R. Chiya bar Abba, in the name of R. Jochanan ~~really said~~: The Rabbis teach (that one must not institute more than thirteen fasts) only as to rain (lack of rain), but as to all

other calamities, one continues to fast until the fasts are answered (the calamities are removed).

The same is taught in a Baraitha: What the Rabbis say about fasting three fasts (the first and middle fasts) and (the last) seven fasts, refers only to rain, but in the case of other calamities, one continues to fast until the fasts are answered. Should you say that this refutes R. Ami (who said that one must not trouble the community too much), R. Ami might answer: There are here two different opinions of two Tannaim, for it is taught (in another Baraitha): They do not institute more than thirteen public fasts in order not to trouble the community more than sufficient, this is the opinion of Rabbi; Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel says: This is not the reason (why there are not more than thirteen fasts for lack of rain, that the community might be troubled too much). It is because (after the thirteen fasts) the time for the first shower is past.

The people of Nineveh sent to Rabbi (to ask the following question: Suppose that even at the time of the summer solstice, we need rain, what shall we do? Shall we consider ourselves individuals or a community? If as individuals, ^{would have to} shall we pray for rain in the benediction regarding prayer (the fifteenth of the original "Eighteen Benedictions"), ^{while} ~~or~~ if as a community, ^{would have to} shall we pray for rain in the benediction of the years (the ninth)? Rab sent them back the answer: Ye shall consider yourselves as individuals and pray for rain in the benediction treating of prayer (the fifteenth). The objection was raised as follows: Rab Judah has said: When (is this the order of the fasts)? When the years are

normal (when it is sowing time in Marchesvan and harvest time in Nisan) and Israel dwells in its own land, but in our time all depends upon the year (whether it needs much or little rain) and upon the place (for instance Nineveh which needs rain at the time of the summer solstice). Then it was said to the objectors: You bring a Baraitha to refute Rabbi. Rabbi is a Tanna (a higher authority) and may differ with a Baraitha. What is the outcome of all this? Rab Nachman said: One prays for rain in the benediction of the years (the ninth); Rab Shesheth said: In the benediction treating of prayer (the fifteenth). The rule is however, according to Rab Shesheth.

The Mishna teaches: On Monday the doors (of the shops) are left ajar shortly before sunset; on Thursday, all day in honor of the Sabbath.

Gemara: The question was raised (in the academy): How is it? Does the Mishna really teach that on Monday the doors of the shops are left ajar shortly before sunset, but on Thursday, they are left ajar all day in honor of the Sabbath? *or does it teach that* Perhaps, on Monday the doors are left ajar, while on Thursday they are kept open all day? Come and hear! for it is taught in a Baraitha: On Monday the doors (of the shops) are left ajar towards evening, while on Thursday they are kept open all day in honor of the Sabbath. If the shop has two doors, one is kept open and one closed; if the shop has a portico opposite the door, the shop may be kept open as usual (even on Monday) for there is no harm done (since the shop cannot be seen).

The Mishna teaches: If these (seven fasts), are passed without

X rather: unless people have confidence
to him that his prayer during persecution
will be answered like that of Joshua

being answered, one lessens one's efforts to some extent in business, in building and in planting.

Gemara: It is taught: By building is meant building for joyful purposes and by planting is meant also for joyful purposes. This building refers to the making of a canopy for a son's marriage; this planting refers to planting a royal banquet-hall. (Others take בנין to mean a permanent dwelling and נטיעה to mean a temporary structure and refer both to a son's marriage).

The Mishna teaches: If these (seven fasts) are passed without being answered, men are less demonstrative in their greetings.

The Rabbis teach: Colleagues (scholars) do not exchange greetings; if however, the common people greet them, they return the salutation with low voice and with seriousness. And they are wrapped up and sit like mourners and men excommunicated, like men under the rebuke of God before he has shown them mercy.

R. Elazar said: A prominent man is not permitted to prostrate himself (to humiliate himself before the public) unless ^{it is certain that he is} he feels himself as great as Joshua bin Nun, ^{and} then will he be heard like him, for it is said (Josh. 7:10): "Arise, why hast thou prostrated thyself?" R. Elazar furthermore said: A prominent man is not permitted to gird himself with sack-cloth unless ^{it is certain that} he feels sure he will be answered like Jehoram, the son of Achab, for it is said (II. K. 8:30): "And it came to pass, when the king heard the words of the woman, that he rent his clothes as he was passing along the wall, and the people looked, and behold, he had sack-cloth beneath upon his flesh." (The famine was removed) (IK. 7:1).

X the meaning is ~~some~~: not all can
accomplish their wish, to enslave, by mere
prostration (וּבִשְׁכָּוָה) but need tearing (וּבְשִׁטְּוֹן).
Only such men like Hori and Aron have
been answered by God. Joshua and Elders
had to be.

X because the "Waw" combines him with
Hori and Aron spoken of in the
immediately preceding verse 23:1
from which we learn that Hori and
Aron only prostrated, so that
the prostration mentioned there
may also refer to Joshua

R. Elazar further said: Not every one is answered if he tears his garments or prostrates himself. Moses and Aaron were answered after having prostrated themselves, but Joshua and Caleb (who were not as prominent) were only answered when they had rent their garments. In the case of Moses and Aaron, it is written (Num. 14:5): "Then Moses and Aaron fell upon their faces". In the case of Joshua and Caleb, it is written (Num. 14:6): "And Joshua bin Nun and Caleb ben Yephunneh rent their garments." To this opinion R. Zera, and according to others, R. Samuel bar Nachmani objected: If the text simply had Joshua, your opinion would hold, but since the text has "And Joshua", we conclude that he did both (he prostrated himself and tore his garments).

R. Elazar furthermore said: Not every one will rise (before Israel in Messianic times) and not every one will bow down; kings will rise, but princes will bow down, for it is written (Is. 49:7): "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, (folio 15a) to him who is despised by men, to him who is abhorred by nations, to the servant of rulers, kings shall see it and rise up, princes, and they shall prostrate themselves." To this opinion R. Zera, and according to others, R. Samuel bar Nachmani objected: If the text read "And princes shall bow down", your opinion would hold, but since the text has: "Princes and they shall bow down", we conclude that both kings and princes shall rise and also prostrate themselves.

Rab Nachman bar Isaac said: I myself do not think that every one will enjoy the light, nor will every one enjoy gladness; the righteous shall enjoy the light and the upright shall enjoy gladness, for it is

written (Ps.97:12): " Light is shown for the righteous and gladness
for the upright of heart."

2. d. 11

CHAPTER II.

Mishna: What is the order of proceedings on (public) fast-days? The people carry out the ark to an open place in the city and put on top of it wood-ashes and likewise on the head of the Nasi and the President of the Court, while each person puts the ashes on his own head. An old man among them speaks to them admonitions to penitence as follows: My brethren, it is not said of the people of Nineveh: And God saw their sack-cloth and their fasts, but (Jon. 3:10): "And God saw their deeds, that they had turned from their evil way". And in the tradition (the Prophets), the prophet says (Another translation might be: And in his rebuke, the prophet says): "Rend your hearts and not your garments". (Joel 2:13).

When they stand for prayer, they bring down before the ark an old man, one skilled (in reading the prayers), one who has children with nothing in the house, in order that he may give his whole attention to his prayer. This man recites for them twenty-four benedictions, eighteen which are usually recited on week-days and six additional ones.

These are the Zichronoth (that portion of the Musaf of New Year's Day which treats of Divine remembrance) and the Shafaroth (that portion treating of Revelation): Ps. 120: "In my distress, I called upon the Lord and he answered me"; Ps. 121: "I lift up my eyes unto the mountains; whence shall come my help?"; Ps. 130: "Out of the depths, I cried unto the Lord" etc; Ps. 102: "A prayer of the afflicted when he is overwhelmed.".

Rab Judah says: One need not say the Zichronoth and the Shofaroth, but in place of them, one says the sections (I. K. 8:37): " If there be famine or pestilence in the land" and (Jer. 14:1): " The word of the Lord which came unto Jeremiah regarding the plague. . . . ". To each benediction, one adds at the end the gist of the benediction.

To the first is added: He who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, Redeemer of Israel.

To the second is added: He who answered our fathers by the Red Sea will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who rememberest the forgotten.

To the third is added: He who answered Joshua at Gilgal will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who hearkenest unto the sound of the trumpet.

To the fourth is added: He who answered Samuel at Mizpeh will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who hearest complaint.

To the fifth is added: He who answered Elijah on Mt. Carmel will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who hearest prayer.

To the sixth is added: He who answered Jonah from within the whale will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who answerest in time of trouble.

To the seventh is added: He who answered David and Solomon, his son, in Jerusalem will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of

X. the second verb ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~also~~ ^{also}
an imperative, repetition of the
first, the same with יִצְוָה .

your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who showest mercy unto the land.

It happened (folio 15b) in the time of R. Chalafta and R. Chananya ben Theradyon that some one stepped before the ark and recited the whole of the benediction and the people did not answer, Amen! Then the superintendent of the prayer-meeting said: Sound the plain note, ye Priests; ^{and they} ~~they did so~~. (Whereupon he who stepped before the ark continued): He who answered Abraham, our father on Mt. Moriah will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day (after which the superintendent of the prayer-meeting said): Sound the tremolo, ye sons of Aaron; ^{and they} ~~they did so~~. (Then he who stepped before the ark said): He who answered our fathers by the Red Sea will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. But when the matter came before the Rabbis, they said: This custom does not prevail except at the Eastern Gate and on the Temple-mount.

On the three first fasts, the men of the guard (a weekly division of Priests and Levites for duty in the Temple) begin to fast but do not finish. (They must have strength in case they are needed to help in the service), but the men of the priestly division (a smaller group for each day of the week) do not fast at all. On the three middle fasts, the men of the guard begin to fast and finish, while the men of the priestly division begin but do not finish. On the seven last fasts, both the men of the guard and the priestly division begin to fast, and fast until night. The above is the opinion of R. Judah, but the Rabbis say: On the three first fasts, neither the men of the guard or of the

priestly division fast at all; on the three middle fasts, the men of the guard begin to fast but do not finish, while the men of the priestly division do not fast at all; on the seven last fasts, the men of the guard begin to fast and fast unto the end, while the men of the priestly division begin to fast, but do not finish.

The men of the guard are permitted to drink wine by night but not by day. (At night they are not likely to be needed). The men of the priestly division are not permitted to drink wine either by day or night. (They are busy all the time). The men of the guard and the men of the post (priests, Levites and Israelites who accompany the daily services in the Temple with prayers) are forbidden to shave and to wash (all that week in which they serve). However, these things are allowed on Thursday in honor of the Sabbath.

Every day which is mentioned in Megillath Taanith on which it is forbidden to hold a lamentation; the day before it is also forbidden but not the day following. R. Jose says: The days both before and after are forbidden.

Every day which is mentioned in Megillath Taanith on which it is forbidden to fast; one may fast the day before and the day after. R. Jose says: One is forbidden to fast the day before, but allowed the day after.

The Rabbis do not decree a fast for the public beginning on Thursday in order not to cause a sudden rise of market-prices (by creating the impression of impending scarcity), but the three first fasts are on Monday, Thursday and Monday, while the three middle fasts

read: In mentioning the order of proceedings
among which is the case of the electrical
has only in mind the last case.

are on Thursday, Monday and Thursday. R. Jose says: Just as the three first fasts are not begun on Thursday, so with the middle set of fasts and the last fasts.

The Rabbis do not decree a public fast upon the New-moon, Chan- uoka or Purim. But if one has begun his fasts (has vowed them before and they conflict with any one of these holidays), they do not interrupt. The above is the opinion of Rabban Gamaliel; R. Meir said: Although Rab- ban Gamaliel said that they do not interrupt their fasts (in case of a conflict with a holiday), yet he confessed that they did not finish them. The same applies when the ninth of Ab falls on Friday (when one eats toward evening).

The Mishna says: What is the order of proceedings on (public) fast- days? The people carry out the ark to an open place in the city etc.

Gemara: (Is this the order) even for the first three fasts? But this is contradicted by the following passage: On the three first and second fasts men enter the synagogue and pray as they pray the whole year, but on the seven last fasts, the people carry out the ark to an open place in the city and put on top of it wood-ashes and likewise on the head of the Nasi and the President of the Court, while each in- dividual puts it on his own head. (Hence this is the order only for the last set of fasts. R. Nathan says: They must bring wood-ashes). Rab Pappa said: Our Mishna teaches the same thing as the Mishna just quoted (that reference is only made to the last seven fasts).

The Mishna teaches: And the people put wood-ashes on the head of the Nasi.

Gemara: And the Tanna teaches further on: Each one puts it on his own head. Is this true? Is it not taught: Rabbi says: In the case of distinction, one begins with the greatest, but in the case of dishonor, one begins with the smallest. We infer that as regards distinction, one begins with the greatest, because it is said (Lev. 10: 6): "And Moses said unto Aaron and to Elazar and to Ithamar". And we infer that as regards dishonor, one begins with the smallest for it is said: At first the serpent was cursed, then Eve and finally Adam. Here also it is a matter of distinction for them (the Nasi and the President of the Court, even when the people put wood-ashes upon their heads), for the people say to them: Ye are men of distinction; pray for us and for the people.

The Mishna teaches: Each one puts it on his own head.

Gemara: The Nasi and the President of the Court should also be like these and should put the wood-ashes on their own heads. Why should another man take the ashes and put them on their heads? R. Abba of Caesarea said: It is not the same when one humiliates one's self (folio 13 a) as when one is humiliated by others. Where does one put the ashes? R. Isaac said: In the place where one puts the phylacteries, for it is said (Is. 61: 3): "To grant unto the mourners of Zion, to give to them ornament (קֶשֶׁט) in the place of ashes" (קֶשֶׁט also occurs in Ezek. 24: 17 in the sense of something bound around the head).

Why do the people go out to an open place? R. Chiya bar Abba said: This is done with this idea: We have prayed in private (in the

synagogue) and were not answered; let us now humiliate ourselves in public. Resh Lakish said: It is done to signify that we are exiled (from our synagogue). May our exile be an atonement for us. What is the practical difference (between these two opinions)? The difference is that (according to Resh Lakish) they might proceed from one synagogue to another (so that they need not appear in public).

Why do they carry the ark to an open place in the city? R. Joshua ben Levi said: This is to signify that we had a vessel undefiled, but it has become unclean through our iniquities. And why do they gird themselves with sack-cloth? R. Chiya bar Abba said: This is to signify that we are as unworthy as the beasts. Why do they put wood-ashes on top of the ark? R. Judah ben Pazzi said: They do this in the sense of Ps. 91:15—"I will be with him in distress." Resh Lakish said: It is done in the sense of Is. 63:9—"In all their affliction he was afflicted." R. Zera said: Formerly when I saw the Rabbis putting wood-ashes upon the ark, my whole body trembled.

Why does each individual put ashes upon his own head? In regard to the reason for this, there was a difference of opinion between R. Levi bar Chama and R. Chanina. One said: It is done to signify that we are considered as dust before thee. The other said: It is done to remind us of the ashes (of the ram substituted for Isaac). What is the practical difference (between these two opinions)? The difference is that (according to the opinion of R. Levi bar Chama) the dust of earth (is meant). *may also suffice.*

Why do they go out to the cemetery? There was a difference of opinion also as to this between R. Levi bar Chama and R. Chanina. One said: It is done as if to signify that we are as the dead before thee. The other said: It is done in order that the dead may intercede for us. What is the practical difference (between these two opinions)? The difference is in the case of a gentile cemetery. (There may be a place where there is no Jewish dead; the dead of the gentiles cannot intercede).

What is the meaning of the words in II. Chron. 3:1—"On Mt. Moriah"? As to this there is again a dispute between R. Levi bar Chama and R. Chanina. (While the Gemara is speaking of the differences between these two rabbis, he also mentions this one as to Mt. Moriah). One said: The mount is so called (מִסְכָּל) because from it went forth instruction (מִסְכָּל) to Israel. (This opinion is based on Is. 2:3 and Dt. 33:10). The other said: It is so called because from it went forth unto the gentiles the fear מִסְכָּל (of Israel and Jerusalem of whose greatness they had heard).

The Mishna teaches: An old man among them speaks to them admonitions to penitence.

Gemara: Our Rabbis teach: If there is present an old man, he speaks to those assembled; if not, a scholar speaks; if there is no scholar present, then a man of tall stature (of fine presence) addresses them. Do they mean any old man, even if he is not a scholar? Abaye said: This following is what is really meant: If there is present an old man who is a scholar, he addresses the assembly, if no such

person is present, a scholar is chosen and if such a one cannot be found, a man of stature speaks the admonitions to penitence.

He says: My brethren! sack-cloth and fasting do not accomplish the desired result, but rather repentance and good deeds, for thus we find in regard to the men of Nineveh; For it is not said of them: And God saw their sack-cloth and fasting, but it is said (Jona. 3:10): " And God saw their works that they had turned from their evil way. " It is also said (Jon. 3:8): " And they covered themselves with sack-cloth, both man and beast. " What did they really do? They tied up the cattle in one drove to, the young in another and said to God: Master of the universe! If thou dost not have mercy upon us we will not have mercy upon these.

It is said (Jon. 3:8): " And they shall call upon the Lord with might. " What did the men of Nineveh say (when they called upon the Lord with might)? They said to him: Master of the Universe! the submissive and the unsubmissive, the righteous and the wicked; which shall yield to the other? It is said (Jon. 3:8): " And they shall turn every man from his evil way and from the violence which is in their hands. " What is the sense of "the violence (the stolen thing) which is in their hands"? Samuel said: Even if one has stolen a beam and has used it in building a castle, he must tear the whole castle down and restore the beam to its owner.

Rab Adda bar Ahaba said: A man who has in his possession something which he has stolen, and he confesses to having stolen it, but does not return it; to what is such a man compared? He is compared

to a person who holds in his hand a worm(an unclean creeping thing);even if he bathes in all the water of the universe,his bath will not remove the uncleanness. But if he casts it from his hand,as soon as he has bathed in forty seah of water,his bath neutralizes the uncleanness,for it is said (Prov.28:13): " He who confesses his wrong-doing and abandons it will be shown mercy." The same idea is taught in the verse (Lam.3:41): " Let us lift up our hearts with our hands unto heaven."

The Mishna teaches:When they stand for prayer,they bring down before the ark an old man,etc.

Gemara: It is taught:When they stand for prayer,although there may be present an old man who is also scholarly,they only bring down before the ark a man who is accustomed to recite the prayers. (What is understood by this expression, ^{לזקן})? R.Judah says:One who has little ones and has nothing (with which to support them);who has labor invested in the field.(He is concerned for this reason about rain),but his house is empty. He must be of unspotted reputation,humble and affable;he must have sweetness and a pleasing voice. He must be skilled in reading the Law,the Prophets and the Hagiographa,also in learning the Midrash,the Halachas and the Haggadas;he must also be able to repeat fluently all the benedictions.

The Rabbis turned their eyes upon R.Isaac bar Ami.(folio 10b) Is not the expression-one who has little ones and has nothing -the same as this-his house is empty? Rab Chasda said:This latter ex-

pression refers to one whose house is empty of transgression. What is the meaning of the phrase, *אין ביתו* ? Abaye said: It refers to one of whom there was no ill report even in his youth.

It is written (Jer. 12:8): " My heritage is become unto me as a lion in the forest; it sent forth its voice against me; therefore do I hate it." What is the meaning of "it sent forth its voice against me "? Mar Zutra bar Tobijah said in the name of Rab: According to others, it is Rab Chama who said it in the name of R. Elazar: This verse refers to the public reader of prayers who stands before the ark and who is unworthy.

The Mishna teaches: This man recites for them twenty-four benedictions, eighteen which are usually recited on week-days and six additional ones.

Are there six additional benedictions? There are seven, for the Mishna teaches: At the end of the seventh benediction, the following is said: Praised be he, who has mercy upon the land. ^{and} Rab Nachman bar Isaac ~~said~~: What ~~is meant~~ ^{by} the seventh benediction? ~~Here~~ reference is made to the seventh benediction which is lengthened. (It refers to the seventh of the original "Eighteen Benedictions", not to one of the additional ones, for it is taught: One lengthens the benedictions referring to the redemption of Israel. And at the end of the benediction (the old man who is skilled in reading prayers) says: He, who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah, will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry today. Praised be thou, O God, Redeemer of Israel. Then the people answer:

see to p. 97

author misunderstood the
whole passage.

Amen! and the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says to them: Sound the plain note, ye sons of Aaron, ^{Sound} and they do so. Then the old man continues: He, who answered our fathers by the Red Sea will answer you and will hearken to the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, who rememberest the forgotten. Then the people answer after him: Amen! and the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says to them: Sound the tremolo note, ye sons of Aaron! and ^{Sound} they do so. So alternately with all the benedictions; after one, the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says: Sound the plain note! after the next he says: Sound the tremolo!

Where does the above custom (of the people answering Amen) prevail? This custom prevails in the country, but not in the Temple, because the people do not answer Amen in the Temple. Whence do we know this? It is written (Neh. 9:5): "Arise! praise ye the Lord, your God, from eternity to eternity. And let men bless thy glorious name which is exalted above all blessings and praise." One might suppose that for all the benedictions, there was but one formula of praise (~~Blessed be the name of thy glorious kingdom for everlasting.~~) Therefore Scripture says: "Thy glorious name is exalted above all blessing and praise." This means: With each benediction give him praise. ~~(Hence it is inferred that the people say: Praised be the name of his glorious kingdom for everlasting and do not say: Amen!)~~

^{was this formula of praise}
But what ~~is the custom~~ in the Temple? The old man says: Praised be the Lord, God, God of Israel from eternity to eternity, praised be the Redeemer of Israel. Then the people answer after him: Praised be

✓ This was the parents of John
in the Penit.

X the name of his glorious kingdom for everlasting. After which the sexton says to them: Sound the plain note, O Priests, sons of Aaron! ~~and they do so.~~ Then the old man continues: He who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah will answer you and will hearken to the voice of your cry this day. Praised be the Lord, God of Israel who rememberest the forgotten. After which the people say: Praised be the name of thy glorious kingdom for everlasting, and the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says to them: Sound the tremolo, O Priests, sons of Aaron! ~~and they do so.~~ So alternately with all the benedictions; after one the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says: Sound the plain note! after the next he says: Sound the tremolo! until all have been finished.

This was the custom of R. Chalafta in Sepphoris and R. Chananya ben Theradyon in Sikni, but when the matter came before the Rabbis, they said: This is not the custom except at the Eastern Gate and on the Temple-mount.

There are those, who say according to the teaching of a Bar-aitha: The old man recites for them twenty-four benedictions, eighteen which are usually recited on week-days and six additional ones. These six, where are they said? They are inserted between the benediction treating of redemption and the following which treats of healing the sick. The former benediction is lengthened. After the old man finishes each benediction, the people answer: Amen! So they used to do in the country, but in the Temple, they used to say: Praised be the Lord, God of Israel from eternity to eternity. Praised

be the Redeemer of Israel, and the people did not answer after him:

Amen! Why not? Because they do not answer Amen in the Temple.

What is the basis for this? Because it is written (Neh. 9:5): "Arise! praise ye the Lord, your God from eternity to eternity. And let men praise thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise." With each benediction give praise, ^{i. e.} *praise of God without the* :

Our Rabbis teach: After the first benediction, the old man says: Praised be the Lord, God of Israel from eternity to eternity. Praised be the Redeemer of Israel. After which the people answer: Praised be the name of his glorious kingdom for everlasting. Then the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says: Sound the plain note, ^{Shema} O Priests, and they do so. After this the old man continues: He who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day. Whereupon they sound the plain note, the tremolo and the plain note again.

After the second benediction the old man says: Praised be the Lord, God of Israel from eternity to eternity. Praised be he who remembereth the forgotten. After which the people answer: Praised be the name of his glorious kingdom for everlasting. Then the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says: Sound the tremolo, O sons of Aaron! and they do so. Then again the old man continues: He who answered our fathers by the Red Sea will answer you and will hearken to the voice of your cry this day. Then they sound the tremolo, the plain note and the tremolo again. So alternately with all the benedictions; after one, the superintendent of the prayer-meeting says:

Sound the plain note! after the next he says: Sound the tremolo! until all the benedictions have been finished. This was the custom of R. Chalafta in Sepphoris and R. Chananya ben Theradyon in Sikni, but when the matter came before the Rabbis, they said: This is not the custom except at the Eastern Gate and on the Temple-mount.

The Mishna teaches: R. Judah says: One need not say the Zichronoth and the Shofaroth, but in place of them etc.

Gemara: R. Ada of Japho said: What reason has R. Judah for saying this? The reason is that they do not say Zichronoth and Shofaroth except (folio 17a) on New Year's Day, on the Day of Atonement of the Jubilee-year and in the time of war (Num. 10:9).

The Mishna teaches: To the first is added: He who answered Abraham on Mt. Moriah will answer you and will hearken to the voice of your cry this day. Praised be thou, O God, Redeemer of Israel.

Gemara: There are Rabbis who would reverse (the order of the closing sentences of the fourth and fifth benedictions). They would say in the benediction in which Elijah is mentioned: Praised be thou, O God, who hearest complaint. And in the benediction in which Samuel is mentioned, they would say: Praised be thou, O God, who hearest prayer. I grant what you say in regard to Samuel (that one may close the benediction thus: Praised be thou, O God, who hearest prayer), for prayer is mentioned in connection with him (I. Sam. 7:5) and complaint also (I. Sam. 15:11). But in connection with Elijah, prayer is mentioned (in the miracle on Mt. Carmel), but not complaint. But it is maintained that complaint as well as prayer is

indicated by the expression (I.K.18:37): " Answer me,O God,answer me."

The Mishna teaches:To the sixth is added:He who answered Jonah from the belly of the whale,will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day.Praised be thou,O God,who answerest in time of trouble. To the seventh is added:He who answered David and Solomon,his son,in Jerusalem will answer you and will hearken unto the voice of your cry this day.Praised be thou,O God,who showest mercy unto Palestine.

Gemara: Since Jonah lived much later (in the days of Amazyah according to Seder Olam) than David and Solomon,why is he mentioned (in a benediction) before them? The reason is that the Tanna wishes to close the benediction as follows:Praised be thou who showest mercy unto Palestine.(Therefore for this ending he needs David and Solomon who prayed for the welfare of the land and who built the Temple,the pride of the land). It is taught in the name of Symmachos:They used to say at the end of this benediction (instead of Praised be thou,O God,who showest mercy unto Israel):Praised be thou,O God,who humblest the haughty (to humble them through lack of rain,that they might repent).

The Mishna teaches:On the three first fasts,the men of the guard (a weekly division of Priests and Levites for duty in the Temple)begin to fast,but do not finish etc.

Gemara:It is taught:Why do the Rabbis say:The men of the guard are permitted to drink wine by night,but not by day? Because

has no sense. He meant to say that the
good luck of the priest (priest) that he may
drink wine, is due to the fact that the
Temple is destroyed (destroyed) i.e. the priest
may drink wine for we do not expect that
the Temple will be suddenly rebuilt and
the priest moved.

it is feared that the work will be too much for the men of the priestly division in which case the men of the guard must be ready to come and help. And why do the Rabbis say: The men of the priestly division are not allowed to drink wine either by day or by night? Because they are continually engaged in the service. (This applies even to those men of the guard who are not on duty on a certain day, they may not drink wine).

From this the Rabbis conclude: Every priest who knows to what watch he belongs (and what week in the year it is on duty) and to what priestly division he belongs (what day it is on duty) and knows also that his ancestors were assigned to duty for a certain week (Not all priests were assigned to duty) he must abstain from wine on that particular day of that particular week. If he knows to what watch he belongs, but does not know to what priestly division (What day in the week he must serve) and yet knows that his ancestors were assigned to duty, he must abstain from wine that whole week (in which his watch is on duty). If he knows neither to what watch or what division he belongs, but does know that his ancestors were assigned to duty, he must abstain from wine the whole year. (All this that every man should be ready for duty whenever the Temple is rebuilt). Rabbi says: Every priest is forbidden to drink wine throughout the whole year (even if he knows his genealogy, for the Temple may be rebuilt and the order may be changed or all may be needed for the dedication). But what am I to do since such an ordinance would mean undoing? Abaye said: Whom do the priests now follow in

their drinking of wine? They follow Rabbi.

The Mishna teaches: The men of the guard and of the post are forbidden to ^{cut the hair} shave and to wash (while on duty), but they are allowed on Thursday in honor of the Sabbath.

Gemara: What is the reason for this decision of the Rabbis? Rabba bar bar Chana said in the name of R. Jochanan: In order that the priests should not enter on duty looking dirty. (They must not wait until some day in their week on duty).

Our Rabbis teach: A king's ^{hair} must be shaved every day; the high-priest, every Friday (He must not wait longer), an ordinary priest, once in thirty days. Why must the king shave every day? R. Abba bar Zabda said: Because Scripture says (Is. 33:17): "The king in his beauty shall thy eyes behold." Why should the high-priest ^{cut} shave every Friday? Rab Samuel bar Isaac said: Because the divisions are changed every week (It is proper that they who have not seen him before should see him in his beauty).

What basis have we for concluding that a common priest must ^{cut} shave every thirty days? An analogy is made on the basis of the word ^{cut} שרץ which occurs in connection with the priests and the Nazirites. It is written (Ezek. 44:20): "And their heads shall they not shave close, nor suffer their hair (שרץ) to grow long." It is also written (Num. 6:5): "He shall be holy, letting grow untouched the hair (שרץ) of his head. (The former quotation refers to the priests, the latter to the Nazirites). And as the Nazirite must let his hair grow thirty days, so with the priests. But how do we know

see to p. III.

X The author misunderstood here The entire
discussion.

com
any
the
also
to,
re
pro
g
a

that the Nazirite must let his hair grow thirty days? Rab Mathna said: Every abstinence on the part of a Nazirite which is unqualified must continue thirty days. How do we know this? Scripture says: (Num. 6:5): "He shall be (נ'נ'). The numerical value of the letters of the word is thirty.

Rab Pappa said to Abaye: Perhaps Scripture really meant (Ezek. 44:20) that the priests should not let their hair grow at all. Abaye answered: If the text read *לֹא יִשְׁלַח פָּרַע*: The priests shall not suffer the hair to grow long, it would be as you say. But since it is written *פָּרַע לֹא יִשְׁלַח*, we conclude that the priests may have a growth of hair, but they are not permitted to let it grow too long. If this is so, it ought to apply even in the present time. This matter of the priests not letting their hair grow long is analogous to the matter of wine-drinking. Just as wine-drinking was only forbidden the priests when they entered the Temple-court for service, while otherwise it was allowed, so with regard to the growth of hair. (The Temple no longer exists, hence these ordinances do not apply). Rabbi says: Every priest is forbidden to drink wine throughout the entire year. But what am I to do since, such an ordinance would mean undoing? Abaye said: Whom do the priests now follow in their drinking of wine? They follow Rabbi (folio 17b). From this it follows that the Rabbis should prohibit the priests from drinking wine (even though there is no Temple service). Why is this? Because the Temple may be quickly rebuilt and there be need of a priest ready for service with none to be found. But they need not make a prohibition of growth of hair. But the same can be said with regard to wine.

Wrong

consequently we must according to the Rabbi's prohibition of growth of hair, the only reason for the prohibition of growth of hair is that we might need the priest but in the case of wine, the same can be said with regard to wine.

since he might sleep a little, as Benj. Allen
said, a workman? Answer: did not
R. Newman say that it only holds
when you are

prohibition in the matter of letting the hair grow for a priest could ^{and} shave quickly and be ready for service. If this is so, the same may be said of a priest under the influence of wine; he may sleep a little and enter upon his duties.

Similarly Rammi bar Abba said: A walk of a mile and even a little sleep counteract the effect of wine? But has it not been reported concerning this matter thus: Rab Nachman said in the name Rabba bar Abbahu: The statement of Rammi bar Abba only holds when one has drunk less than a fourth measure of wine, but if one has drunk more than that, walking will be all the more annoying and sleep intoxicating? Rab Ashshe said: Priests who are intoxicated profane the service, therefore the Rabbis prohibited wine; a growth of hair does not profane the service, hence there is no prohibition regarding it. To contradict this statement, the following was quoted: These will be punished by God, priests who serve in an intoxicated condition and those who serve with a long growth of hair.

I grant what you say as to priests serving in an intoxicated condition, for it is expressly stated (Lev. 10:9): "Wine or strong drink shalt thou not drink. . . . lest ye die." But what basis have we for saying that priests who serve with a long growth of hair will be punished by God? It is written (Ezek. 44:20): "And their heads shall they not shave close nor suffer their hair, to grow long." And it is written in the following verse (Ezek. 44:21): "And wine shall none of the priests drink when they enter into the inner court." Both the matter of letting the hair grow long and

that of being intoxicated with wine are found together. Just as God punishes the priests who serve in an intoxicated condition so does he punish those who let their hair grow long. May we not ~~how~~^{never} ever, make the following analogy: As the intoxicated priests profane the service so do those whose hair is allowed to grow long? (This would be a refutation of Rab Ashshe, who said: The priests who let their hair grow long do not profane the service). No! an analogy can be made in regard to Divine punishment but not as to the profanation of the service.

Rabbina said to Rab Ashshe: Before Ezekiel came, who established this comparison? To this question Rab Ashshe answered: According to your argument, what about the statement of Rab Chasda who said (in the case of a priest whose brothers died from circumcision and who could not serve in the Temple)? This thing we have not learned from the Law of Moses, but from the Prophets, for it is said (Ezek. 44:9): "No son of the stranger uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary. .". Before Ezekiel came, who was authority for the prohibition just mentioned? There must have been a tradition (from Moses as delivered at Sinai) and Ezekiel came and gave it support by (reference to) a Biblical verse. So also (in the case of the priests intoxicated with drinks and those who let their hair grow long) an analogy ^{was} may be made as to Divine punishment but not as to the profanation of the service. Then Ezekiel came and gave it support by (reference to) a Biblical verse. *in his own book*

The Mishna teaches: Every day which is mentioned in Megillath Taanith on which it is forbidden to hold a lamentation, the day before it is also forbidden, but not the following day.

Gemara: On these days it is not permitted to fast and on some of them it is forbidden to hold a funeral service. From the first to the eighth of Nisan, the nature of the daily sacrifice was established (in an argument with the Sadducees); therefore there must be no lamentation on these days. From the eighth of Nisan to the end of Passover, the date of the Feast of Weeks was settled. (The question as to whether one begins to count from the second day of Passover or from the Sunday (of the Passover week). Therefore there must be no lamentation on these days.

It is said: From the first to the eighth of Nisan, the nature of the daily sacrifice was arranged; therefore there must be no lamentation on these days. Why is it said? From the first of Nisan? It ought to be from the second of Nisan, for the first (New-moon) is a holiday and it is certainly forbidden (to hold a lamentation on that day). The first of Nisan had to be mentioned to forbid a lamentation the day before. But that lamentation is forbidden the day before also may be inferred from the first of Nisan, for it is the day before the New-moon. (The day before is forbidden). The New-moon is a Mosaic festival and therefore requires no protection for it is taught: On those days which are mentioned in Megillath Taanith, fasting and lamentation are forbidden the day be-

misunderstood

fore and the day after; on Sabbaths and holidays fasting and lamentation are forbidden, but the day before, and the day after these are permitted. What is the ^{reason for this} difference here suggested? Sabbaths and holidays are based on a Mosaic ordinance which requires no protection; the days mentioned in Megillath Taanith are based on an ordinance of the scribes, which does require protection.

It is said: From the eighth of Nisan to the end of Passover, the (time of the) Feast of Weeks was settled; therefore there must be no lamentation on these days. Why is it said: To the end of Passover. Must I not say it means up to Passover? The week of Passover is itself a holiday and it is surely forbidden to have a lamentation on a holiday.

Rab Pappa said: As Rab said in regard to the New-moon, that it was only mentioned (folio 18a) to forbid lamentation on the day before (The first of Nisan is mentioned to forbid lamentation the day before, the twenty-ninth day of Adar, which month is always defective), so in this case, it is only mentioned to forbid this the day after. With whom does this last statement agree? With R. Jose of the Mishna who said: Both the day before and after are forbidden. If it is so, ^{that the end of Passover is mentioned only} ~~then it is only written~~ the first of Nisan in order to forbid lamentation also on the ^{day after Passover} ~~twenty-ninth of Adar~~, ^{then the question arises: (with reference to the forty minutes of the day)} Why is this argument given that it is the day before that on which the daily sacrifice was established? You might have derived this by regarding the twenty-ninth of Adar as the day after the twenty-eighth. (This day is a holiday and according to R. Jose, on

the day after a holiday lamentation is forbidden), for it is taught: On the twenty-eighth of Adar the good news came informing the people that they need not longer refrain from the study of the Law. For it happened once that a decree was issued against the Jews, so that they dared not study the Law, or circumcise their sons or refrain from violating the Sabbath. What did R. Judah ben Shammai and his colleagues do? They went and sought advice from a Roman matron at whose home would be found the most influential men of the city. She said to them: Rise and cry by night. Thereupon they went and cried by night, saying: O God, are we not brothers; are we not sons of one father and one mother? Why are we differentiated from every other nation or people, that you put upon us such bitter persecution? The decree was then revoked, whereupon they made this day (the twenty-eighth day of Adar) a holiday.

Answer: Said Abaye said: It was taught from the first of Nisan to include the case of an Adar, which has thirty days. (The day after the twenty-eighth of Adar would then not coincide with that before the first of Nisan. The thirtieth of Adar could not be inferred as the day after the twenty-eighth, therefore it was necessary to say the first of Nisan to forbid the thirtieth day).

Rab Ashshe said: You might even say that it may be the case if the ^{month} ~~ninth~~ of Adar is defective. (It should be written in Megillath Taanith: From the first of ^{month} ~~Adar~~, etc.). For it is taught: All the holidays, concerning which it is said: A fast may not be held the day after, ~~but~~, a lamentation may. ^{But} Now, since this (the

twenty-ninth of Adar^{is} between two holidays (the twenty-eighth of Adar and the first of Nisan), it is itself considered a holiday and a lamentation^{to} is forbidden on that day.

It is taught: From the eighth of Nisan until the end of Pass-over, the date of the Feast of Weeks was settled. Therefore there must be no lamentation on these days. Why is it said: From the eighth of Nisan? It ought to be from the ninth, for the eighth itself is certainly forbidden, since it is one of the days on which the nature of the daily sacrifice was established. In case persecution came and they were obliged to fast on these holidays (celebrated in commemoration of settling the character of the daily-sacrifice), then they fast for seven days; the eighth itself is forbidden, for it is the first day of those commemorating the establishment of the date of the Feast of Weeks. ^{Also} If you make this inference regarding the eighth of Nisan, the same might be inferred as to the twenty-eighth of Adar also. In case persecution came and the people were obliged to violate the holiday by fasting on the twenty-eighth of Adar, on the twenty-ninth also should be forbidden to fast and hold a lamentation, since it is the day before the first of those commemorating the settling of the nature of the daily sacrifice (the first of Nisan). The following was reported: Rab Chiya bar Assi said in the name of Rab: The law is according to Rab Jose (He said: Both the day before and after are forbidden); Samuel said: The law is according to R. Meir (Whenever an opinion is stated in the Mishna anonymously, it is attributed to R. Meir. The Mishna here

merely forbids the day before, but not the day after). Did Samuel hold the opinion? Is it not taught: Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel says: Why in (Megillath Taanith) does the text have the word ^{לילה} twice? This repetition is to signify that on these days it is forbidden to fast, but not on the days before and after. And Samuel said: The law is according to Rabban Simeon ^{ben} Gamaliel. (There is no contradiction). Formerly Samuel held when there was no other teaching except that of R. Meir, who was less rigorous, to the opinion of R. Meir. But when Samuel heard the teaching of Simeon ben Gamaliel who was still less rigorous (than R. Meir), he held to the opinion of Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel.

In the same way Bali said in the name of Chiya bar Abba who spoke in the name of R. Jochanan: The law is according to R. Jose. Whereupon R. Chiya bar Abba said to Bali: I am of the opinion that when R. Jochanan said that the law is according to R. Jose, he referred to the days (mentioned in Megillath Taanith) on which it is forbidden to fast. (Before it is forbidden, after it is allowed. This is like R. Jose and not like R. Meir, who said: Even before, it is allowed. But as to lamentations, the law is not like R. Jose who said that lamentation is forbidden the day before and after, but like R. Meir: Before it is forbidden, after it is allowed.). Did R. Jochanan hold this opinion? (The day before is forbidden according to R. Jose). Did he not say: The law is according to the anonymous Mishna; for we learn in the Mishna of Megilla: Although the Rabbis say that the scroll of the book of Esther may be read before its time (the

fourteenth of Adar) but not after, (folio 18b) lamentation and fasting are permitted on those days.

To which day does this refer? Shall we say that it refers to those who observe Purim on the fifteenth day of Adar and read the scroll on the fourteenth? Is lamentation and fasting permitted on the fourteenth even to those observing Purim on the fifteenth? Is it not written in Megillath Taanith: The fourteenth and the fifteenth of Adar are the days of Purim on which it is forbidden to hold a lamentation? Raba said: (This was not written to forbid lamentation and fasting on the fourteenth to those who observe Purim on the fourteenth, or to forbid these on the fifteenth to those who observe the holiday on the fifteenth, for this is expressly stated in Scripture). This was written to signify that for instance, the fifteenth was forbidden to those who had to observe the fourteenth, and the fourteenth to those who had to observe the fifteenth. ^{must be} May the statement in Megilla ^{must be} not refer to those who observe Purim on the fourteenth of Adar (country towns and cities) and who read the scroll on the thirteenth? (This is the case when the fourteenth falls on Tuesday and the reading occurs on the previous market-day, Monday). But this ^{thirteenth day} is Nicanor day (on which it is forbidden to fast or have a lamentation.) ^{must then} May then the statement in Megilla ^{must then} not refer to those who observe Purim on the fourteenth of Adar and who read the scroll on the twelfth. (This is the case when the fourteenth falls on Wednesday and the reading occurs on the previous market-day, Monday). ^{But} This is Trajan's Day (on which it is for-

bidden to fast and hold lamentation). May then the statement in Megilla not ^{must then} refer to those who observe Purim on the fourteenth of Adar and who read the scroll on the eleventh. (This is the case when the fourteenth falls on Sunday and the men of the walled-cities read the scroll on the previous market-day, the eleventh). From this it might be inferred that although it is the day before Trajan's Day, the Mishna in Megilla permits lamentation and fasting on that day (the eleventh). This inference is not correct. The Mishna really refers to the twelfth of Adar. What you say as to the twelfth being Trajan's Day may be refuted by the fact that Trajan's Day itself may be violated, for on that day Shemaya and Achiya, his brother, were slain. When Rab Nachman decreed a fast for the twelfth of Adar, the Rabbis remonstrated, saying: It is Trajan's Day. But he answered: Trajan's Day itself may be violated, for on that day, Shemaya and Achiya, his brother were slain. But it might have been inferred that on the twelfth of Adar, it was not permitted to fast, for that is the day before Nikanor-day. Rab Ashshe said: If the day itself is violated, must not the day before be violated?

What is Nikanor-day and what is Trajan's Day? It is taught as follows: Nikanor was one of the governors of the Greeks. Every day he used to stretch forth his hand toward Judaea and Jerusalem and say: When will the city fall into my hands that I may tread on its ruins. But when the Hasmonean dynasty became strong and conquered Nikanor, the people cut off the thumbs of his hands and feet and hanged them on the gates of Jerusalem saying: Here revenge is

thus obtained upon the mouth which spoke proudly and the hands which were stretched forth against Jerusalem.

What is Trajan's Day? They tell the story: When Trajan sought to kill Lulianus and Papus, his brother in Laodicea, he said to them: If you are of the people of Chananya, Mishael and Azarya, let your God come and deliver you from me, as he delivered them from Nebuchadnezzar. Lulianus and Papus answered: Chananya, Mishael and Azarya were truly righteous and they were worthy of having a miracle performed for them; Nebuchadnezzar also was a worthy king and deserving of a miracle. But this man is good for nothing and is undeserving of having a miracle performed and we are very guilty before God. If thou didst not kill us, God has many slayers and many bears and lions in his world who would have slain us. But God has only handed us over into your hands in order to punish you in future for our blood. Nevertheless he slew them at once. They add; Lulianus and Papus had hardly moved from the spot when despatches arrived from Rome and his head was split with clubs.

The Mishna teaches: They do not decree a series of public fasts beginning on Thursday They do not decree a fast on New-moon. . . . but if they have begun to fast, they do not finish.

Gemara: What is understood by the expression: If they have begun to fast (after which they do not cease)? R. Acha said: If they have fasted three fasts (Monday, Thursday and Monday); R. Jose said: If they have fasted once. Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: This is the opinion of R. Meir in the name of Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel:

He teaches (that they do not finish their fast), but the Rabbis say:
One fasts and finishes his fast (One fasts until it grows dark). Mar
Zutra explained in the name of Rab Huna: The law is: One begins to
fast and finishes his fast.

CHAPTER III.

Mishna: The order of fasts which is mentioned (in chapter one, folio 10) refers to the first rainfall. (If the time of the first rainfall has passed and the fasts of the individuals and the thirteen public fasts have not been answered). But if the produce degenerates (gives forth a poorer produce), the alarm is sounded at once. They do likewise when the rain has failed to come down for a period of forty days, for this is regarded as a plague which will cause dearth. (If there is an interval between the first and second rainfall of forty days). If the rain comes down suitable for the produce, but not for the trees, or if for the latter and not the former, or if it is suitable for both, but not for the cisterns, wells and pits, (receptacles for the rain), they sound the alarm at once. Likewise, if there is one city on which it does not rain (while it does rain on a neighboring city), for it is written (Am. 4:7): "And I will cause it to rain on one city, but not on another; one portion shall have rain. . . ." (folio 19a). That city fasts and sounds the alarm; the neighboring cities also fast (The city without rain will come to them to buy provisions and will cause famine) but do not sound the alarm. R. Akiba says: They sound the alarm but do not fast.

Likewise the city in which there is a plague or a crash (its walls and buildings are blown down by the wind) fasts and sounds the alarm, while the neighboring cities fast, but do not sound the alarm; R. Akiba says: the latter sound the alarm, but do not fast.

is a euphemism.

What is meant by plague? If from a city which sends out five hundred footmen, there is carried out three dead bodies within three consecutive days, this is considered a plague; anything less than this is not regarded as a plague.

They sound the alarm in every place for the following pests: Blast, mildew, locust, grass-hoppers, wild beasts and invaders. The reason for sounding the alarm is that these are epidemic.

It happened that some scholars went down from Jerusalem to their respective cities (in Palestine) and decreed a fast, because the grain in Askelon showed as much as an oven's content of blast. On another occasion they decreed a fast because on the other side of Jordan, wolves devoured two children. R. Jose says: It was not because the wolves devoured the children but merely because the wolves were seen (and might come into the city).

They sound the alarm on the Sabbath (by the *shofar*) for the following causes; A city surrounded by invaders, a river overflowing its banks or a ship dismantled at sea. R. Jose says: They cry for help but not in prayer. Simeon the Themanite adds as a cause, pestilence, but the Rabbis do not agree to this.

For every affliction that it may not come upon the community, they sound the alarm, with the exception of too much rain. It once happened that the people said to Choni Hammeaggel (the circle-drawer): Pray that the rains may come down. He answered: Go out and bring in the Pascal ovens (which are of clay and portable) in order that they may not be softened (by the rain). He prayed but the rain did not come down. What did he do? He drew a circle and stood on it saying:

to God: Master of the universe! thy children have turned to me for I am as one of thy house-hold. I swear by thy great name that until thou dost have mercy upon thy children, I will not move from this spot. Then the rain began to fall gently; Choni said: Not for such rain did I pray, but for rain suitable for the cisterns, wells and pits. Upon this the rain came down heavily, but Choni once more said: Neither did I ask for such rain but only for those which are favorable, blessed and pleasant. Then the rain began to come down properly until the Israelites came out of Jerusalem to the Temple-mount on account of the rain. They came to Choni and said: As thou hast prayed for the rain to come down, so now pray that it may cease. He replied: Go out and see if the Stone of Losers (a place in Jerusalem where lost and found things were deposited and claimed) is covered.

Thereupon Simeon ben Shetach sent to him saying: If you were not Choni, I would excommunicate you, but what can I do to you, for thou comest petulantly before God and yet he does thy will. Thou art like a spoiled child that lords it over his father and yet the father gives in to the child. Of such as thou art, does Scripture say (Prov. 23: 25): "Let then, thy father and thy mother rejoice, and let her that hath borne thee be glad."

If one fasts and the rain comes down before the sun rises, one need not finish the fast. But if the rain comes down after sun-rise, one need not fast to the end. R. Eliezer says: If the rain comes down before noon, one need not fast longer; if, after noon, one

must fast to the end. It happened once that a fast was decreed in Lod (Lydda) and the rain came down before noon. Upon this, R. Tarphon said to the people: Go, eat and drink and have a holiday. They went and ate and drank and observed the day as a holiday. When twilight came, the great Hallel (Psalm 136) was read.

Gemara: The Mishna teaches: The order of fasts which is mentioned refers to the first rain-fall. To contradict this, the following may be quoted: The first rain-fall and the second is the time to pray for rain, but not until the time of the third rainfall does one fast. R. Judah said: The expression-the order of fasts which is mentioned refers to the first rainfall-really means (until what time?) Until the time when the first, second and third rainfalls have passed and the rain has not come down, but if the rain has come down at the time of the first rainfall, and the seed is sown, but does not grow, or also, if it grows, but becomes degenerate, then sound the alarm at once.

Rab Nachman said: This is certainly done if the produce has become degenerate (In this case it is necessary to pray at once that the produce may be restored to its proper state), but if it is withered, it is not done. (The produce is beyond remedy and prayer would be vain). This is plain, for the Mishna itself says: If the produce has degenerated, they sound the alarm at once; is not Rab Nachman's statement then superfluous? No! it is necessary for he refers to the seeds which produce stalks again (They revive a little after having withered) since you might think this shooting up is something (enough to awaken new hopes of recovery) therefore he mentions it.

The Mishna teaches: If there is an interval of forty days between the first and second rainfall, etc.

Gemara: What is a plague of dearth? Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: A calamity which will produce dearth. Rab Nachman said: When provision has to be imported on rivers (canals), it is called dearth (Food may be imported by means of ships); (folio 19b) when provision has to be imported from one country to another, it is called famine. (Food must then be imported by means of camels).

R. Chanina said: If a measure of wheat commands a price of a ~~shekel~~ ^{sele} but the wheat is to be had, it is considered a time of dearth; if however, four measures are sold for a ^{sele} shekel, but the wheat is very scarce, then it is a time of famine. R. Jochanan said: The above is only the case when money is plentiful and food is scarce; if however, money is scarce while food is plentiful, they sound the alarm at once, for R. Jochanan said: I can remember when four measures of wheat were sold for a shekel and many people swelled of hunger in Tiberias, because there was not an as (because of a scarcity of money).

The Mishna teaches: If the rain comes down suitable for the growths, but not for the trees, etc.

Gemara: I grant that rain may descend suitable for the produce but not for the trees, since it may descend gently and not heavily; I grant also that it may be suitable for the trees but not for the produce, since it may come heavily and not gently; I likewise grant that it may come down suitable for both produce and trees and not for the cisterns, wells and pits, since the rain may be both gentle and heavy,

without being too much. But I cannot grant the following which is taught: If the rain comes down suitable for the cisterns, wells and pits, but not for the produce or the trees. How can this be? This is the case when the rain comes down in torrents.

Our Rabbis teach: When there is no rain for the trees, they sound the alarm at half the period of preparation for the Passover (fifteen days before Passover); when there is no rain for the cisterns, wells and pits, they sound the alarm in the middle of the Feast of Booths. Under all circumstances, if there is no water to drink, they sound the alarm at once. What is understood by at once? Monday, Thursday and Monday. For all these things they only sound the alarm in their own town-government (where the receptacles for water are empty). When there is an epidemic of croup, the alarm is only sounded when it is fatal; otherwise, not. They also sound the alarm on account of gobay (a species of edible locusts) if it has injured the grain even the least bit; R. Simeon ben Gamaliel says: Even on account of the hoppers (another species of edible locusts).

Our Rabbis teach: The alarm is sounded on account of the trees in the other years of the septennial period (but not on the Sabbatic year, for then the produce is any body's property); if rain is needed for the cisterns, wells and pits, the alarm is sounded even in the Sabbatic year. R. Simeon ben Gamaliel says: If rain is needed for the trees, the alarm is sounded even in the Sabbatic year, because the trees furnish subsistence to the poor.

Another Baraita teaches: The alarm is sounded on account of the

mother : scarce , scanty

trees needing rain in the other years of the septennial period; if rain is needed for the cisterns, wells and pits, the alarm is sounded even on the Sabbatic year. Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel says: If even in the Sabbatic year rain is needed for the trees and the after-growth, the alarm is sounded, because they furnish subsistence to the poor.

It is taught: R. Elazar ben Parta said: From the time when the Temple was destroyed, the rains have become irregular and arbitrary gifts for the world; in some years rains are abundant, in others, scanty; in some years rains come down in season, in others, out of season. With what is the year in which the rains come down in season, to be compared? With a servant to whom his master has given his fare (for the week) on Sunday. Consequently the servant has plenty of time to bake the dough properly and the bread may be enjoyed. With what is the year in which the rains do not come down in season, to be compared? With a servant to whom his master has given his fare (for the week) on Friday. Consequently the servant has no time to bake the dough properly and the bread cannot be enjoyed.

With what is the year in which the rains come down in abundance, to be compared? With a servant to whom his master has given his fare (for the year) at one time. (The servant grinds it altogether.) When the mill-stone grinds, there is as much waste from a Kor (a very large measure) as from a Kab (a very small one); similarly with the dough; there is as much waste from a Kor as from a Kab (The same amount clings to the kneading-pan). With what is the year in which the rains

are few to be compared? With a servant to whom his master gives his fare little by little. Consequently the mill stone, when it grinds a Kab, wastes as much as from a Kor, similarly with the dough; no more is wasted from a Kor than from a Kab. (In the case of rain, the clefts swallow up a certain amount of water, where there is an abundance or a scarcity of rain; in the case of an abundance, there is plenty of water left to fructify the ground, but not if the rains are scarce).

The following is another version. With what is the year in which the rains are abundant, to be compared? With a man who mixes clay. If he has so much water, that there is no lack, he can mix his clay well; if he has so little water that there is a lack, his clay cannot be mixed well.

The Rabbis teach as follows: It happened once that all Israel made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the time of a festival and they had no water to drink. Nakdimon (Nicodemus) ben Goryon (a wealthy citizen of Jerusalem during the siege by Vespasian and Titus) went to one of the noblemen of the city (a non-Jew) and said: Give me the loan of twelve springs of water for the pilgrims and I will pay you back twelve springs (when the rains come down). If I do not pay you back, I will give you twelve talents of silver. Then he fixed the time limit. When the appointed day came and the rains had not come down (so that Nakdimon ben Goryon could not pay back the twelve springs), the nobleman sent a message to Nakdimon ben Goryon, saying: Send me the money or the water in return for what I have given you. To this Nakdimon answered: I have still some time, for the whole day is mine.

At noon the nobleman again sent the same message: Send me the money or the water in return for what I have given you. Again Nakdimon ben Goryon sent back the message: I have still some hours in the day. In the afternoon the nobleman sent the same message for the third time, and received a similar answer to what he had before obtained; The day is not yet over. The nobleman poked fun at Nakdimon ben Goryon saying: The whole year the rains have not come down (folio 20a) will they descend just at this time? He entered a bath-house feeling happy. While the nobleman did this Nakdimon ben Goryon entered the Temple depressed. He wrapped himself up, stood for prayer and said: Master of the universe! it is known and revealed to thee, that not for my own glory have I done this nor for the honor of my father's house, but I have acted for thy glory in order that the pilgrims might have water. At once the heavens became covered with clouds and the rains came down until the twelve springs were filled with water and more rain fell besides. As the nobleman went forth from the bath-house, Nakdimon ben Goryon came out of the Temple. When they met, Nakdimon ben Goryon said: Pay me the value of the water which has fallen in addition to what I borrowed. At this the nobleman said: I know that God caused the world to shake solely on thy account, but I still have a basis to claim from you my money, for the sun had already set (when the rain came down), therefore it came down in my territory (after the time-limit).

Nakdimon again entered the Temple. He wrapped himself up, arose for prayer and said: Master of the universe! let it be known that thou hast beloved ones in thy world. At once the clouds were scattered and

the sun came out. At that time the nobleran said to Nakdimon ben Goryon: If the sun had not been pierced (shone), I would have had a basis to claim from you my money. There is a teaching that the name of this pious Jew was not Nakdimon but Boni; Why is he called Nakdimon? Because on his account the sun was pierced (so that it shone).

The Rabbis teach: On account of three men was the sun pierced (made to shine): Moses, Joshua and Nakdimon ben Goryon. I grant that it was done for Nakdimon ben Goryon according to the tradition above quoted; I also grant that it was done for Joshua, since Scripture says: (Josh. 10:13): "And the sun stood still and the moon stayed. . . ." But what basis is there for concluding it was done for Moses? R. Elazar said: It may be inferred by an analogy on the basis of the word אָנאָן (I begin). It is written (Dt. 2:25): "This day will I begin (אָנאָן) to put the fear of thee. . . ."; it is also written (Josh. 3:7): "This day will I begin (אָנאָן) to make thee great. . . ." (אָנאָן occurs in connection with the war of Joshua and that of Moses; since the sun was pierced for the former, it is inferred that it was also done for the latter).

R. Samuel bar Nachmani said: It may be inferred by an analogy on the basis of the word אָנאָן (to put). It is written (Dt. 2:25): "This day will I begin to put (אָנאָן) the fear of thee. . . ."; it is also written (Josh. 10:12): "On the day when the Lord put (אָנאָן) the Amorites. . . ." R. Jochanan said: It (that the sun was pierced for Moses) may be inferred from the text itself, for Scripture says (Dt. 2:25): "Whoever shall hear the report of thee shall tremble and shall quake before thee." When shall they do this? When the sun is pierced for Moses.

The Mishna teaches: Likewise if there is one city on which it does not rain (while it does rain on a neighboring city).

Gemara: Rab Judah said in the name of Rab: It is a curse for both cities. (Reference is made to Amos 4:7 One city has too much rain, the other has none; in both cases the grain is spoiled.).

It is written (Lam. 1:17): "Jerusalem is become as an unclean woman among them." Rab Juda said in the name of Rab: This is written in the sense of blessing: as there is release for an unclean woman, so is there a remedy for Jerusalem. It is also written (Lam. 1:1): "She is become as a widow." Rab Judah said: This also is written in the sense of blessing. The text has "like a widow" (כְּאַיְמָן). This does not mean a widow literally; rather a woman whose husband has gone to some foreign province with the intention of returning.

It is written (Mal. 2:9): "Therefore have I also made you contemptible and low before all the people." Rab Judah said: This too is written in the sense of blessing. It signifies that there should not be among us any tax-gatherers and commissioners (either Persian or Roman officers).

It is written (L.K. 14:15): "And the Lord will smite Israel as the reed is swayed in the water". Rab Juda said in the name of Rab: This likewise is written in the sense of blessing for R. Samuel bar Nachmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: What is meant by the verse (Prov. 27:6): "Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but deceptive are the kisses of an enemy? Better is the curse which Achiya the Shilonite spoke against Israel than the blessing which the wicked Bileam spoke. Achiya the

Shilonite cursed them through the reed, for he said (I.K. 14:15): " And the Lord will smite Israel as the reed is swayed in the water." The reed grows in a watery place; its shoots change and its roots are large; Even if all the winds in the world come and blow upon it, they cannot move it from its place, but it sways with them to and fro. When the winds are quiet, the reed remains in its place.

However Bileam the wicked fellow blessed Israel through the cedar, for it is said (Num. 24:6): " As the cedars (by the side of the waters)" The cedar does not grow in a watery place, its shoots do not change and its roots are not large. Even if all the winds in the world come and blow upon it, they do not move it from its place; when however, the south-wind blows upon it, it uproots and overturns it. Furthermore the reed has the honor of being used to make a pen with which is written the Bible (Law, Prophets and Hagiographa).

The Rabbis teach: Man should always be as yielding (gentle) as the reed, but never as unyielding (hard) as the cedar. It happened once that R. Elazar, son of R. Simeon came from Migdal Gedor, from the house of his teacher. He was riding on an ass and took the path along the shore of the river. He was in very good spirits and was quite proud of himself because he had learned a great deal of Thora. (folio 20b). The Rabbi met a man who was very ugly, who said to him: Peace be unto you, Rabbi! but the Rabbi did not return the greeting. He said: Good-for-nothing fellow, how ugly this man is! I wonder if all the men of your city are as ugly as you. The man said: I do not know, but go to the workman who made me and say: How ugly is this vessel which thou hast made! When the Rabbi

recognized the wrong he had done, he alighted from his ass and prostrated himself before the man, saying to him: I humble myself before you, forgive me. The man replied: I cannot forgive you until you go to the workman who made me and say to him: How ugly is this vessel which you have made.

The Rabbi took up his journey, following to the city the man he had offended. The inhabitants of that city came out to meet the Rabbi saying to him: Peace be unto thee, Rabbi! Rabbi! Teacher! Teacher! The ugly man said to the people: Whom are you calling Rabbi? They answered: Him who is walking behind you. Thereupon the ugly man said: If he is a Rabbi, may there be no more like him in Israel. The people hearing this, said: Why do you speak like this? Because he has done so and so to me. After the story, the people answered: Even so, forgive him, for he is a man of great learning. The ugly man answered: For your sake then I will forgive him provided he does not continue to act in this way. Thereupon R. Elazar, son of R. Simeon at once entered (the school-house) and taught: A man should always be as gentle as a reed, but never as hard as a cedar. Because the reed is what it is, it has the honor of being used to make a pen with which is written the scroll of the Law, the phylacteries and the inscriptions on the door-posts.

The Mishna teaches: Similarly a city in which there is a plague or a crash, etc.

Gemara: The Rabbis teach: By the term crash (נִפְּלָה) is meant that of sound buildings, not of such as were out of repair and unlikely to fall in, but of such as were out of repair and likely to fall in. Is

there any difference between sound buildings and those unlikely to fall in? And likewise is there any difference between those out of repair(unsound) and those likely to fall in? (Is not one of each of these expressions superfluous?) No!each is necessary,for there is the case of a building whose walls are high,or that where a building is built on the bridge of a river.(In these cases the buildings are sound,but still they are likely to fall).

Similarly there ^{was} ~~is~~ the case of the building out of repair which was in Nehardea,alongside of which Rab and Samuel would not pass although it stood for thirteen years. One day,Rab Ada bar Ahaba came to Nehardea. Samuel said to Rab:Come and go around (so as not to pass the ruined structure). But Rab answered:It is not necessary to-day,for Rab Ada bar Ahaba is with us;his merit is great and we need not apprehend any danger.

Rab Huna had an ass in a certain building out of repair and he wished to remove it. He brought up Rab Ada bar Ahaba to the place and entered into an earnest discussion as to the law while he released the ass. Hardly had he left the building when it fell in. Rab Ada bar Ahaba became excited and angry. He had the same opinion as R.Jannai who said:A man should never stand in a dangerous place thinking that a miracle may happen for him;perhaps the miracle may not happen. And even if it should come to pass,it takes off so much from his merits. Rab Chanan said:What Biblical basis have we for this? It is written (Gen.32:11):" I am made less by all thy mercies and thy truth." (The translation should be:" I am too little for all thy mercies and thy

truth".)

affair, event *It was that when*
 What was the work of Rab Ada bar Ahaba? Similarly ~~it~~¹ is reported

in the story His disciples asked him: Why are you permitted to live so long? He answered: All my life I never became angry in my own house; I never walked ahead of one who was greater than I; I never studied in filthy alleys, nor did I ever walk four paces without studying the Thora or without the phylacteries; I never slept in the school-house with intent or by accident; I never rejoiced at the misfortune of another; I never called any of my neighbors by the nick-name (which others had given him), or, according to another version, by an opprobrious surname (given him by myself).

Rab said to Raphram bar Pappa: Please tell us some of the good deeds which Rab Huna did. Raphram bar Pappa replied: Of Rab Huna's youth I recall nothing, of his old age, I remember that on every cloudy day, he used to be brought around in a gilt carruca (a carriage used by persons of distinction) and examine every city and every building. Whatever was out of repair, he ordered to be torn down. If the tenant was in a position to rebuild, he did so; if not, Rab Huna built it himself.

On every Friday, toward evening he used to send his messengers to market and every vegetable which was left over with the gardeners, they used to buy and he would throw them into the river. But why did he not give them to the poor? Because the poor would then always rely upon him and they would not come to market to buy. (There might be weeks when there was nothing left over and the poor would then have

nothing for the Sabbath). Why then did he not throw the food to the cattle? Because he was of the opinion that man's food is not given to the cattle. Why did he buy it at all? He did it in order that they should not stumble in future. (Otherwise the gardeners, fearing that they might have a great deal left over might not provide again for the Sabbath meals).

Whenever he obtained a medicinal remedy, he used to fill a jug of water and hang it upon a corner of his house and announce: Every one who wants any, let him come and get it. Another version says: He had a tradition as to how to cure a certain disease called shibatha. (He could counteract the evil spirits who afflicted those who ate without washing their hands). He used to take a pitcher of water and hang it up and announce: Let any one who needs this come and take advantage, that he may not come into danger.

Whenever he dined, he used to open his door and announce: Any one who needs food, let him come and eat. Raba said: All these things we are able to carry out except the last (to invite every one to eat), because there is too large a host (of poor) in Machuza.