

Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?

RABBI LIONEL E. MOSES

This paper is an appendix to the paper “Annual and Triennial Systems For Reading The Torah” by Rabbi Elliot Dorff, and was approved together with it on April 29, 1987 by a vote of seven in favor, four opposed, and two abstaining. Members voting in favor: Rabbis Isidoro Aizenberg, Ben Zion Bergman, Elliot N. Dorff, Richard L. Eisenberg, Mayer E. Rabinowitz, Seymour Siegel and Gordon Tucker. Members voting in opposition: Rabbis David H. Lincoln, Lionel E. Moses, Joel Roth and Steven Saltzman. Members abstaining: Rabbis David M. Feldman and George Pollak.

Abstract

In light of questions addressed to the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards from as early as 1961 and the preliminary answers given to these queries by the committee (Section I), this paper endeavors to review the sources (Section II), both talmudic and post-talmudic (Section IIa) and manuscript lists of sedarim (Section IIb) to set the triennial cycle in its historical perspective. Section III of the paper establishes a list of seven halakhic parameters, based on Mishnah and Tosefta, for the reading of the Torah. The parameters are limited to these two authentically Palestinian sources because all data for a triennial cycle is Palestinian in origin and predates even the earliest post-Geonic law codices. It would thus be unfair, to say nothing of impossible, to try to fit a Palestinian triennial reading cycle to halakhic parameters which were both later in origin and developed outside its geographical sphere of influence. Finally in Section IV, six questions are asked regarding the institution of a triennial cycle in our day and in a short postscript, several desiderata are listed in order to put such a cycle into practice today.

The Committee on Jewish Law and Standards of the Rabbinical Assembly provides guidance in matters of halakhah for the Conservative movement. The individual rabbi, however, is the authority for the interpretation and application of all matters of halakhah.

שאלה

Is there an authentic triennial cycle of Torah readings?

Section I: Previous Opinions of the CJLS

תשובה

As early as 1961, two members of the Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbis Manuel Greenstein and Theodore Steinberg, wrote to the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards requesting information about the triennial cycle of reading the Torah. Specifically, both rabbis asked if there was any pattern among Conservative congregations which utilized the triennial cycle and what, in principle, was the CJLS's attitude to such a practice.

In answer to the latter question, Rabbi Jules Harlow, acting as Secretary of the CJLS, responded that "the abbreviation of the Torah reading may be allowed in congregations where the change is deemed essential after careful consideration." Thereby was established the halakhic permissibility of abbreviated Torah readings, sadly without reference to precedent in the classical literature.

With respect to the former question regarding the pattern of such abbreviated Torah readings, Rabbi Harlow responded that "there seems to be no pattern among our congregations in this area." Rabbi Harlow then continued by citing two possible procedures used by a number of congregations:

- (1) a triennial system; and
- (2) a system wherein the *כהן עליה* is read at Shabbat *מנחה*, the *לוי עליה* on Monday morning, *שלישי* on Thursday and *רביעי* to the end of the *פרשה* on Shabbat morning.

Rabbi Harlow then added that those using the triennial cycle should remember:

- (1) that no less than three verses must be read for each *עליה*.
- (2) the entire portion read must contain no less than 10 verses.
- (3) that on Shabbat morning, at least seven men be called to the Torah.

Two issues should be noted regarding Rabbi Harlow's judicious response of December 20, 1961:

- (1) He does not in any way define or outline what the CJLS means by triennial cycle.
- (2) *De facto*, he accepts the legitimacy of the custom of a number of Conservative congregations wherein they abbreviate the Shabbat morning Torah selection by reading the first three *עליות* at Shabbat

מנחה and during the week and only the last four עליות on Shabbat morning.

This latter point is important because twelve years later the CJLS apparently had a change of heart regarding the legitimacy of this approach. Responding to a question of Rabbi Charles Sherman, who cited the latter approach as the one currently in practice in his congregation and requested “as much information as is available” on “an authentic Tri-annual (*sic.*) Reading,” Rabbi Mayer Rabinowitz, then serving as the Secretary of the CJLS, stated that “the committee has never stated what *the* authentic triennial reading is” and further noted, in agreement with Rabbi Sherman that “the present system you use is ‘distorted.’”

A further request for information on a triennial cycle came from Rabbi Joseph Hirsch, who asked the CJLS if there were any plans to produce a triennial Torah reading that is consecutive, like the ancient practice of ארץ ישראל. Rabbi Hirsch also asked that appropriate הפטרה be indicated and noted that “the creation of (such) a consecutive lectionary would be a very positive and helpful step . . .” In his response of June 17, 1977, Rabbi Rabinowitz again noted that the CJLS has agreed in principle with the triennial cycle, but has felt that “the question is best left to the individual rabbi as the מרא דאתרא of the community.”

Two other pieces are currently on file regarding the triennial cycle. The first, written by Rabbi Edward Sandrow, comes from the R.A. Program Notes, 1967. The second was written by Rabbi Barry Dov Lerner in 1980. Rabbi Sandrow’s article divides each of the traditional פרשיות into three sections, according to the seven traditional עליות. In each of the three years, the first עליה (כהן), which is read on Shabbat afternoon and Monday and Thursday morning, is read on Shabbat morning as well. Thereafter, the remaining six עליות are divided over the three year cycle with adjustments being made for very short פרשיות (נצבים, וילך), double פרשיות (ויקהל-פקודי) and for the inclusion of portions with special significance (עשרת דברות, שירת הים, etc.).

Rabbi Lerner’s article is based on that of Rabbi Sandrow. It has the one added feature that in places he begins to attempt to divide the particular readings into עליות, although the עליות have not been worked out exhaustively for the entire cycle. Rabbi Lerner further notes that he has followed the traditional custom of having עליות begin and end on a good note rather than a sad one.

While Rabbi Sandrow and Rabbi Lerner have produced a triennial cycle for reading the Torah that is reasonable and practical, one in which the entire Torah is read over the three year period, two issues are worthy of note:

(1) One עליה, that of the כהן, is consistently read in each of the three years, so that in effect, preference appears to be given to one section of

the Torah. The same might be said with regard to individual פרשיות which, because of their size and not because of their liturgical significance, are read *into* each year of the triennial cycle.

(2) The very premise of these two cycles automatically undermines the principle “אין מדלגין בתורה” [one should not skip about the Torah].¹

Of secondary relevance is the fact that such an arbitrary division of the traditional 45 Babylonian פרשיות ignores the fact that the traditional Babylonian, הפטרות were often chosen because they correspond to one verse or one idea in the פרשה. By arbitrarily dividing the פרשה without considering the הפטרה, the הפטרה recited may bear no relation to those sections of the Torah read in a given year of the cycle.

Section II: Sources for the Triennial Cycle

The commonly acknowledged source for reading the Torah according to a so-called triennial cycle is the Palestinian custom which divided the Torah in to סדרים to be read consecutively from week to week and which would be completed in approximately three years. The sources for this custom fall into two categories:

(1) talmudic and post-talmudic sources which refer generally to the completion of the reading of the Torah in ארץ ישראל in three or three and one half years;

(2) sources which specify the exact number of these סדרים and give us detailed lists of the סדרים and thereby allow us to determine the required time to complete such a triennial cycle.

We will review each category of sources in turn, but it is crucial to point out that we in fact have not one list of סדרים but three: one containing 141 סדרים, one containing 154 סדרים, and one containing 167. The variation in the number of סדרים is further complicated by the fact that we do not know on which of the three to rely. Furthermore, as Heinemann notes, the number of *Shabbatot* on which the consecutive סדרים were read does not correspond from year to year, since the consecutive reading was interrupted when festivals and special readings (like פרשת פרה, etc.) occurred on Shabbat.² Thus, we do not even know if a given list had sufficient סדרים (or for that matter, too many סדרים) for the cycle to be completed in precisely three years.

Section IIa: Talmudic and Post-Talmudic Sources

The Babylonian Talmud makes only one oblique reference to the triennial cycle: “The people of the west (i.e. the Jews of ארץ ישראל) who complete [the reading] of the *Torah* in three years.”³ No further amplification of this text is given and the context in which it is embedded

adds nothing to our understanding of the problem.⁴ All that we learn from the *Bavli* is that by the fourth or fifth century the Jews of Babylonia were reading the Torah on an annual cycle, that this cycle differed from the triennial cycle used in ארץ ישראל, and that the Babylonian Jews were aware of the difference in custom.

Among the post-talmudic sources that make reference to the triennial cycle is the *Mishneh Torah*:⁵

המנהג הפשוט בכל ישראל שמשל מין את התורה בשנה אחת... ויש מי שמשלים את התורה בשלש שנים ואינו מנהג פשוט.

The widespread practice in all of Israel is to complete the Torah in one year. There are some who complete the Torah in three years, but this is not a widespread practice.

The key word is obviously פשוט, which apparently means “widespread.”⁶ This understanding of פשוט is consistent with the scholarly opinion that the triennial cycle was no longer in use anywhere after the thirteenth century. Note that it does not even specify which communities follow the triennial cycle.⁷

Another post-talmudic source that again provides precious little information about the triennial cycle is a passing reference in the *Travels of Benjamin of Tudela*. After traveling as far east as Persia and then south through Arabia and Yemen, Benjamin arrived at Aswan in Upper Egypt. He then traveled north, finally reaching Fayum which he identified as the biblical Pithom.

Four days from thence [i.e. Fayum] brings us to מצרים, or Memphis, commonly called Old Cairo. This large city stands on the banks of the Nile called Al-Nil, and contains about two thousand Jews. Here are two synagogues, one of the congregation of Palestine called the Syrian, and the other of Babylonian Jews, or those of Iraq. They follow different customs regarding the division of the Pentateuch into פרשיות and סדרים. The Babylonians read one פרשה every week, as is the custom throughout Spain and finish the whole of the Pentateuch every year, whereas the Syrians have the custom of dividing every פרשה into three סדרים, concluding the lecture of the whole once in three years. They keep, however, the long-established custom of assembling both congregations to perform public service together, as well as on the day of the joy of the law [i.e. *Simhat Torah*] as on that of the dispensation of the law [i.e. *Shavuot*].⁸

Benjamin lived in the twelfth century and traveled in the east between 1160 and 1173, thus placing him in Egypt about the time that Maimonides arrived there, although he makes no reference to him.

His information about the triennial cycle is again imprecise; he does, however, add the interesting detail that the Jews of the Palestinian congregation joined those of the Babylonian congregation for the annual celebration of *Simḥat Torah*. As we shall see further on, this is an example of the intrusiveness of the Babylonian customary on the Palestinian, at a time when it became increasingly difficult for the Palestinian Jews to resist the encroachments of the all-pervasive Babylonian rabbinate.⁹

Whereas *Megillah* 29b and Benjamin of Tudela both speak of a Palestinian cycle of readings complete in three years, one other source called *ארץ ישראל ובני מצרה* *אנשי שבין אחילוקים*¹⁰ specifies three and half years for the completion of the *Torah* reading cycle. The two paragraphs that make specific reference to the triennial cycle are paragraphs 47 and 48.¹¹

(47) אנשי מזרח קורין בפרשה שליה צבור ועם ובני ארץ ישראל קורין העם
פרשה ושליח צבור סדרים.
(48) אנשי מזרח עושין שמחת תורה בכל שנה ובני ארץ ישראל לג' שנים
ומחצה

Margulies proceeds to explain *Hilluk* 47 by saying that in Babylonia everyone reads the entire *פרשה*: the precentor in the synagogue and the people at home, who read the *Torah* once in Hebrew and once in the Aramaic *Targum*. In *ארץ ישראל*, the precentor reads a *סדר* in the synagogue, but the people, influenced by Babylonian custom, read the entire *פרשה* at home.¹²

Two other sources refer obliquely to the triennial cycle by stating the number of *סדרים* in the reading of the *Torah*. *Midrash Esther Rabbah*, commenting on Deuteronomy 28:68b, *ולשפחות ואין קנה והתמכרתם שם*, includes the following exegetical comment:¹³

רב אמר ע"י הקנייתם דברי הברית שאין בכם מי קונה דברי חמשה ספרי תורה
מנין של קנה

This exegesis fixes the number at 145. Alternately *Massekhet Soferim*¹⁴ fixes the number of *סדרים* at 175:¹⁵

הלכך קובעין קע"ה סדרים בתורה בכל שבת ושבת עולת תמיד

Section IIb: Lists of *סדרים*

Attempts to establish lists of the official *סדרים* of *ארץ ישראל* begin with Buchler in an important article that begins all research into the triennial cycle.¹⁶ Buchler made use of Genizah material then available but began with the untenable hypothesis that the triennial cycle began in Nissan.¹⁷

It is interesting to note that Buchler rejects the number of סדרים fixed by *Massekhet Soferim* at 175 since his thesis required the cycle to begin every third year in Nissan. To date, no list has been found which has more than 167 סדרים.

Research in the lists of סדרים was moved dramatically forward in 1940 when Jacob Mann published his classic study, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*. In his Prolegomena, Mann noted that the lists of סדרים, with all their variants, preserved by the Masoretes, constituted the final stage in the fixation of the triennial cycle. The midrashic literature, especially the *Tanhuma* versions of Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah, reveal the existence of many different סדרים, showing that numerous shiftings had taken place.¹⁸ Like Buchler before him, Mann also became involved in an untenable thesis that proposed סדרים that even more than the midrashic selections were developed around and based on the Palestinian סדרים, they were dependent on the respective הפטרות to the latter.¹⁹ Mann's work was never completed; Numbers 6:1 was as far as Mann was able to proceed before his death. Yet, he identified 105 סדרים and over 50 sub-סדרים, some of which, Wacholder argues, never existed.²⁰ In spite of the criticisms leveled against Mann, it was he who identified most of the Genizahh fragments of the triennial cycle and laid the ground work upon which the students of *Midrash* and Masoretic Studies could later build.

Mann also drew a connection between the קרובות (liturgical poems) of the sixth century Palestinian *paytan* Yannai²¹ and the סדרים and הפטרות of the triennial cycle. Significantly, Mann realized that while the קרובות corresponded, on the whole, to the evidence from the Genizahh fragments, they were written before the triennial cycle became fixed and hence reveal different commencements of the Torah readings and prophetic readings.²² We shall return later to Mann's observations regarding the characteristics of the סדרים and their respective הפטרות in connection with their practical halakhic implications.

In 1963, Issachar Joel published a כתר from a Bible manuscript written in 1290 and acquired by the National Library in Israel from Damascus. Like other Bible mss., the weekly פרשיות (according to the annual cycle) and the weekly סדרים (according to the triennial cycle) were marked, although the markings came from a later hand.²³ This כתר presents a third option by listing 141 סדרים, a number previously unknown for the division of סדרים in the triennial cycle.²⁴ Joel rejects the possibility that this listing of 141 סדרים was merely intended for the private use of the reader and concludes instead that the scribe who added the notations actually had in his possession an entirely different tradition from the one listing 154 סדרים at the end of the Torah text. Nonetheless, a comparison of the three possible arrangements of סדרים (for details see footnote 24)

shows that there are not really any fundamental differences among them; rather extra סדרים were created by the subdivision of long סדרים in the shorter lists into shorter סדרים or by the combination of shorter סדרים in the longer list into larger units.

Joel assumes the division of the Torah reading into 154 סדרים to be the standard division and argued that it would provide sufficient סדרים for a triennial cycle in which two of the three years were intercalated. This would occur twice in fifty-seven years and Joel assumed that in the seventeen other three-year cycles various סדרים would be combined, much as we do in the annual cycle.²⁵

Joel argues that the shorter list of 141 סדרים is best explained by the Bavli's two possible explanations of M. *Megillah* 3:4. This Mishnah presents the appropriate Torah readings for each of the four special *Shabbatot* in *Adar* and then says בחמישית חזורין לכסדרן. This portion of the Mishnah is explained in two ways by two Palestinian *Amoraim*, R. Jeremiah and R. Ami:²⁶ Rav Jeremiah says חזורים לסדר ההפטרות, while Rav Ami says חזורים לסדר הסדרין. According to R. Jeremiah on these four special Sabbaths, only the regular cycle of prophetic readings is interrupted, but the weekly סדר is read in addition to the special Torah reading. According to R. Ami, the regular cycle of Torah readings is interrupted; on these four *Shabbatot* only the special Torah reading is read and only on the fifth Shabbat do we return to the regular cycle of Torah readings. According to Joel's argument, which appears tenuous at the very least,²⁷ those congregations which followed R. Ami's explanation and stopped the regular cycle of סדרים on the four special *Shabbatot* in *Adar* would have to complete the triennial reading in 12 less *Shabbatot* over the three year period. Thus, Joel concludes, the division into 141 סדרים reflects the actual divisions of the Torah for a community that interpreted M. *Megillah* 3:4 according to R. Ami.²⁸ Joel carries his thesis one step further by suggesting that the difference between the arrangement with 141 סדרים and that with 167 סדרים is 26 weeks of half a solar year. Since *Massekhet Soferim* refers to a Palestinian tradition of completing the *Torah* reading in three and a half years, Joel concludes that 167 סדרים is the requisite number of Torah readings for those who follow this latter custom and also interpreted M. *Megillah* 3:4 according to R. Ami.²⁹

Perhaps the most significant contribution of Joel was his collation of the various סדרים found both in the list at the end of the *כתר* and marked in the body of the *כתר*.³⁰ This collation of lists of סדרים and their corresponding הפטרות was expanded by Ben Zion Wacholder and is currently the most comprehensive list available.³¹ Wacholder designates a total of 154 different סדרים (see Appendix I below). Wacholder follows Joel in assuming that the recorded variations in the number of סדרים

reflected local custom, although he is less dogmatic in attempting to provide an explanation. Furthermore, he agrees that 154 became the standard number of סדרים, because the number appears again and again in the mss. and because it harmonizes with the divisions of the fragments of הפטרות of the triennial cycle, as well as with the קרובות of Yannai.

Before proceeding with some of the halakhic problems engendered by establishing a new triennial cycle, it is important to draw some conclusions about the triennial cycle as it existed in ארץ ישראל.

(1) Until the fifth century at the earliest, there was probably no standardized division of the Torah into סדרים.

(2) The designations of both Bavli *Megillah* 29b on the one hand, and Tractate *Soferim* on the other, that the Jews of ארץ ישראל completed the reading of the Torah in three years and three and a half years respectively are only approximations, although Wachholder believes that three and a half years comes closer to reality, at least in the Geonic period.³²

(3) The impulse toward the standardization of both the number of סדרים and their initial verses was probably the result of Babylonian influence and that resulted in 154 סדרים becoming the most widespread number.

(4) *Simhat Torah* in ארץ ישראל was not the last day of *Sukkot*, as was the custom for those who followed the annual cycle, but occurred on whatever Shabbat the cycle of readings was completed in a given locale and could occur both in the winter and in the summer.³³

Section III: The Halakhic Parameters for Reading the Torah

Before we attempt to apply the data regarding the so-called triennial cycle to the contemporary situation, we must briefly review the halakhic requirements for reading the Torah on Shabbat.

(1) M. *Megillah* 4:3 teaches us that on Shabbat at least seven people must be called to the Torah.³⁴

(2) T. *Megillah* 3:11 expands M. *Megillah* 4:2 and establishes a dispute between R. Akiba and R. Yishmael.³⁵

ביום טוב חמשה ביום הכיפורים ששה בשבת שבעה ואם רצו להוסיף אל יוסיפו דברי ר' ישמעאל. ר' עקיבא אומר ביום טוב חמשה וביום הכיפורים שבעה ובשבת ששה ואם רצו להוסיף מוסיפין.

On *Yom Tov* there were 5 עליות, on Yom Kippur 6, on Shabbat 7, and they may not add, these are words of R. Yishmael. R. Akiba says on *Yom Tov* 5, on Yom Kippur 7, on Shabbat 6, and they may add עליות.

(3) M. *Megillah* 4:4 sets the minimum number of verses read by each reader at three: הקורא בתורה לא יפחות משלשה פסוקים.³⁶

(4) *Tosefta Megillah* 3:17 adds a number of other rulings to the ruling that requires a minimum of three verses to be read by each reader:

(a) אם היתה פרשה של ארבעה של חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולה

If the paragraph in the Torah contains only 4 or 5 verses, one reader must read it in its entirety.³⁷

(b) היתה פרשה של חמשה וקרא שלשה והניח את השנים העומד אחריו לקרות קורא אותן שנים ועוד שלשה בפרשה אחרת.

If the paragraph in the Torah contains five verses, and the first reader read only three and left two, the subsequent reader must read these two and then read at least three more from the succeeding paragraph.³⁸

(5) Mishnah 4:4 also reestablishes the principle of not skipping around in the Torah בתורה אין מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה.

The correct understanding of this principle has serious ramifications for a triennial cycle. Ovadiah MeBartenura explains we must not skip from one issue to another in reading the Torah, but we may skip within one issue, just as the High Priest on Yom Kippur skipped from אחרי מות (Leviticus 16:1-34) to אַךְ בַּעֲשׂוֹר (Exodus 32:14 to Exodus 34:1, all of which concerns God's forgiving Israel for the sin of the golden calf. The *Tifereth Yisrael* explains the reason for not allowing skipping from one issue to another as שְׂמָא יִתְבַּלְבַּל (lest it be confusing). Such an understanding of the Mishnah gives credence to those congregations that currently have adapted what I will call an American triennial cycle and each year read the כהן עליה of the annual cycle and then skip, if necessary, to later עליות in order to complete the reading of the Torah in three years.

Yerushalmi Megillah 4:5 however, seems to understand the Mishnah more literally.⁴⁰

אין מדלגין בתורה. ר' ירמיה בשם ר"ש בן לקיש שאין גולים ספר תורה ברכים.
ר' יוסי בעי. הגע עצמך שהיתה פרשה קטנה. א"ל כדי שישמעו את ישראל
התורה על הסדר.

We do not skip in the Torah reading. R. Yirmiya in the name of R. Shimon ben Lakish says it is because we do not roll the Torah before the congregation. R. Yosi asked, "And if it was a short פרשה?" They answered, "So that Israel will hear the Torah read in order."

While the *prima facie* reason for not skipping in the Torah appears to be to prevent טרחא דציבורא (burdening the congregation) while the Torah is being rolled, the underlying thesis appears to be the assurance of the

orderly teaching of Torah to Israel. The two examples cited above where skipping is permitted are exceptional, since they are both special readings and deal explicitly with the עניני דיומא. Even so we are only allowed to skip because the two sections are close together and the time required to roll the Torah was less than that required by the *Meturgeman* to render the verse into Aramaic.

While it is true that the opinion of R. Jeremiah is not פסק הלכה, it does however, add to our body of knowledge about the triennial cycle in ארץ ישראל, confirming independently that the Torah was read in order. There is then much to commend the so-called Palestinian system of reading the Torah over current praxis in Conservative synagogues.

(6) *Tosefta Megillah* 3:17 adds two other instructive rulings regarding the reading of the Torah which gain significance with regard to establishing a triennial cycle.

(a) אין משיירין בסוף הספר אלא כדי שיקראו שבעה. שייר כדי שיקראו ששה קורא אותה ששה ועוד שבעה בחומש אחר.

In establishing the weekly סדרים, one must leave sufficient verses at the end of each book of the Torah that seven people can be called to the Torah (i.e. at least 21 verses). If one left only enough verses for six readers, these six readers read the requisite verses and then seven additional readers read from the succeeding book of the Torah.⁴¹

(b) אין משיירין בסוף התורה אלא כדי שיקראו שבעה. שייר כדי שיקראו שבעה וקוראו אותן ששה, חזור לתחלת העניין וקורא אותן שבעה.

At the end of the Torah, one must leave sufficient verses for seven people to be called to the Torah; if enough verses were left for seven people to be called, but only six read, one returns to the beginning of the section and seven people read.⁴²

It is interesting to note how the Palestinian סדרים incorporated these two halakhot. The last סדר of Genesis (49:27-50:26) has 33 verses; the last סדר of Exodus (39:33-40:38) has 49 verses; the last סדר of Leviticus (27:1-34) has 34 verses; the last סדר of Numbers (35:9-36:13) has 39 verses; and the last סדר of Deuteronomy (33:1-34:12) has 41 verses.

(7) *Tosefta Megillah* 3:10 appears to provide the precedent for those of our congregations which follow a modified cycle:

ממקום שפוסקין שבת בשחרית, שם מתחילין במנחה. במנחה, משם מתחילין בשיני. בשיני, משם מתחילין בחמישי. בחמישי, משם מתחילין בשבת הבאה.

At the place we finished reading Shabbat שחרית, we begin at Shabbat מנחה, where we stopped at מנחה, we begin Monday at שחרית. Where we ended Monday, we begin Thursday morning. And at the point we ended on Thursday, we begin on Shabbat morning.

The *baraita* is stated anonymously in *Tosefta*, but is cited in the name of R. Meir in the Bavli (B. *Megillah* 31b). This *baraita* comes to explain the ambiguous statement in the Mishnah.⁴³

בשני ובחמישי ובשבת במנחה קורין כסדרן ואין עולין מהם מן החשבון

On Monday, Thursday, and Shabbat מנחה we read in order, and these do not count.

The *רישא* of R. Meir's statement clearly explains כסדרן in Mishnah but the *סיפא* is a direct contradiction of the second part of the Mishnah's view, ואין עולין מהם מן החשבון. No wonder then that *Tosefta* continues with the view of R. Yehudah.

מקום שפוסקין בשבת בשחרית, מתחילין לשבת הבאה.

Where they stopped Shabbat morning, they begin the following Shabbat.

R. Yehudah, according to *Tosefta*, does not appear to contradict the view of R. Meir in the *רישא*, but clarifies the meaning of the Mishnah's view, ואין עולין מהם מן החשבון. R. Zera⁴⁴ then codifies the view of the Mishnah and R. Yehudah in the *Tosefta* as the practical *halakhah*.⁴⁵

הלכה מקום שמפסיקין בשבת שחרית, שם קורין במנחה ובשני ובחמישי ולשבת הבאה.

The law is that where we stopped Shabbat morning, there we begin reading at Shabbat מנחה, and Monday and Thursday mornings, and the following Shabbat morning.

Section IV – Instituting A Triennial Cycle Today

In light of the data adduced regarding both the existence and the nature of the so-called triennial cycle and the halakhic requirements for the reading of the Torah, a number of questions exist regarding the institution of such a cycle in our day:

(1) Can a legitimate triennial cycle be introduced today, in light of the universal practice of an annual cycle since the thirteenth century?

(2) Is there an authentic triennial cycle that should be preferred or mandated for use in our congregations?

(3) Can the halakhic requirements, especially those of the Mishnah and *Tosefta*, successfully be applied to such a triennial cycle, and if so, how?

(4) Do any of the current practices in Conservative congregations have a degree of halakhic legitimacy, in light of the halakhic data analyzed above?

Two additional questions arise as corollaries of the above stated questions:

(1) What should the prophetic selections used for the הפטרה be for a triennial cycle?

(2) Should *Simḥat Torah* be celebrated annually by those who complete the reading of the Torah in three or more years or only when each cycle of the Torah reading is completed?

We will respond to each of these questions in order.

Can a Legitimate Triennial Cycle be Introduced Today?

We might begin to answer this question by saying that it has already been answered by the Law Committee. Having observed that many of our congregations were already abbreviating the weekly portions, the Law Committee voted in 1977 to accept a triennial reading of the Torah in principle. While the Committee followed the principle of פוק חזי (consult common practice) in legitimizing the triennial cycle, the Committee also followed another principle of פסק הלכה, which has been a guiding principle of the Committee since its inception, namely the use of precedent. In using precedent as a principle for accepting a given practice, the Committee has often times used precedents that were even the דעת יחיד, the position of the individual, even where the דעת יחיד was not codified as normative.⁴⁶

We may, however, find further justification for abbreviating the weekly Torah lection by seeing the motivation under which the Jews of ארץ ישראל shortened their weekly reading. Mann already noted that R. Yoḥanan ben Nappaha directed the shortening of the הפטרה to ten verses whenever there was an official *meturgeman* or an accompanying sermon,⁴⁷ apparently in order not to weary the congregation by too prolonged a service. Margulies, in fact, assumes that the custom of lengthy weekly sermons in ארץ ישראל was the motivation for shortening the Torah reading as well.⁴⁸ Since the ostensible purpose of reading the Torah in the first place was pedagogic and since currently the purpose of the sermon ideally should be to teach Torah and make its message more understandable, there seems to be additional justification for abbreviation the formal reading of the Torah to allow ample time for its amplification. Moreover, wearying the congregation by prolonging the service may take away from the aesthetic appeal of the service and thereby discourage people from participating regularly in public worship.⁴⁹

The only impediment to abbreviating the Torah reading might be sought in a *baraita* in the name of Shimon ben Elazar:

רשב"א אומר עזרא תיקן להן לישראל שיהו קורין קלות שבתורת כהנים קודם
עצרת ושבתשנה תורה קודם ראש השנה.

R. Shimon ben Elazar says that Ezra decreed that Israel should read the "curses" found in *Torat Kohanim* (Lev. 26-27) before the *Atzeret* (closing day of Passover) and those in the *Mishna Torah* (Deut. 28) before Rosh Hashana.

This arrangement of the Torah reading presupposes an annual cycle and caused R. Zvi Chajes to question in his *Novellae* how it was possible to square this *baraita* with the Palestinian triennial cycle.⁵⁰

Mann resolves the problem by noting that the *baraita* is found only in the Bavli and questions whether it was ever regarded as authentic in ארץ ישראל.⁵¹ Wacholder resolves the problem by suggesting that both the annual cycle and the triennial cycle originated in ארץ ישראל. Given the diversity of מנהגים in ארץ ישראל, it is possible that R. Shimon ben Elazar's reference to the annual cycle and its antiquity reflected a local Palestinian custom, in contrast to that of Galilee where the divisions of the triennial cycle prevailed. In support of his supposition, he points to the interdependence of the two cycles where 43 of the 54 periscopes of the annual cycle happen to be identical to the beginnings of סדרים in the triennial cycle.⁵²

Is There an Authentic Triennial Cycle that Should Be Preferred or Mandated in Our Congregations Today?

In light of the research which was summarized above and the universal halakhic requirements for reading the Torah, the preferred triennial cycle must be the Palestinian cycle. This cycle, according to the textual evidence divides the Torah into 141, 154, or 167 consecutive סדרים, the variations reflecting local customs in ארץ ישראל.

This ancient triennial cycle has several practical advantages, besides its authenticity. The textual sources provide us with appropriate הפטרות for each of the סדרים.⁵³ Furthermore, the classical *midrashim*, including *Genesis Rabbah*, *Leviticus Rabbah*, the *midrashim* based on *Tanḥuma* (*Exodus Rabbah*, *Deuteronomy Rabbah*, *Tanḥuma* [standard], *Tanḥuma* [Buber]), were all developed around this Palestinian triennial cycle and not around the annual cycle, which was preferred and made universal by the Babylonian Gaonate.⁵⁴ Finally, for the innovative preacher and teacher, there is the entire body of קרובות written by Yannai that provide a wealth of homiletical material focused on the Palestinian cycle of Torah readings and הפטרות.⁵⁵

Can the Halakhic Requirements, Especially Those of Mishnah and *Tosefta*, Successfully Be Applied to Such a Triennial Cycle and If So, How?

In the preceding section of this paper, several halakhic requirements for reading the Torah on Shabbat were analyzed and discussed:

- (1) A minimum of seven persons must be called to the Torah.
- (2) It is permissible to call more than this minimum number of persons.
- (3) Each person called to the Torah must read at least three verses.
- (4) If a paragraph contains only four or five verses, one reader must read it in its entirety. A corollary of this ruling is that if one reader read only three verses, the next reader must read the succeeding two verses and three verses from the next paragraph.
- (5) The Torah must be read in order; hence we may not skip around in the Torah.
- (6) The last section of each book must provide sufficient verses for at least seven persons to be called to the Torah.
- (7) The sections read on Shabbat *מנוחה*, Monday and Thursday, are repeated on the following Shabbat.

For seven people to be called to the Torah, with each person reading a minimum of three verses, each *סדר* must ideally contain at least 21 verses. Of the standard 154 *סדרים* found in the Bomberg Bible,⁵⁶ only 11 fall short of the minimum. The number of verses in these very short *סדרים* range from a minimum of 7 (Numbers 11:16-22) up to 18 (Genesis 20:1-18 and Genesis 25:1-18). Similarly, only 12 *סדרים* have 60 or more verses, the maximum for one *סדר* being 82 verses (Exodus 34:27 – 36:38)

There are three possible solutions to meeting the minimum requirement of seven readers, each one reading a minimum of three verses of the Torah:

- (1) repetition of sufficient verses in order to make up the requisite minimum;
- (2) combination of a short *סדר* either with the preceding *סדר* or the succeeding *סדר*;
- (3) continuing the reading from a short *סדר* into the succeeding *סדר*, but returning to the beginning of the second *סדר* on the succeeding week.

Each of these solutions has its own obvious advantages and disadvantages.⁵⁷ Nor is it here suggested that any one solution must or should be used exclusively. Rather, a combination of solutions to meet the specific needs of the given congregation is possible. While this may detract from uniformity of practice among those congregations using a triennial cycle, we must remember that in *ארץ ישראל* each village and

town apparently followed a slightly different pattern of reading, even after the division of סדרים was standardized.⁵⁸

Even a סדר of 21 verses would be too short to meet the minimum requirement of seven עליות, each consisting of at least three verses, if the סדר contained one or more masoretic paragraphs with four or five verses, since according to the *Tosefta* such a paragraph must be read in its entirety by one reader. Table II provides an analysis of all the סדרים that contained from 21 to 30 verses to determine if the *Tosefta's* ruling provides more than a theoretical difficulty in dividing a סדר into 7 עליות.

A review of Table II shows that 36 of the 154 סדרים listed in the Bomberg Bible (that is slightly more than 25%) have between 21 and 30 verses. Of these, 20 are divided into either one or two masoretic paragraphs indicated either as open paragraph (פרשה פתוחה) or closed paragraphs (פרשה סתומה).⁵⁹ Of the remaining 16 סדרים, 8 are divided into 3 masoretic paragraphs, 3 are divided into 4 masoretic paragraphs and one each into 5, 8, 11, 12 and 13 masoretic paragraphs respectively.

Of the eight סדרים divided into 3 masoretic paragraphs, only two (סדרים 93 and 122) have paragraphs with four verses, and only, one (סדר 55) has a paragraph with five verses. In the remaining five סדרים, it is possible to divide the verses into seven עליות, each with a minimum of three verses without repeating a verse. The same is true of סדר 122, where the first paragraph of 12 verses can be divided into 4 עליות, the second paragraph with 8 verses can be divided into two עליות and the last paragraph with four verses can be read as a unit.

In סדר 55, the first paragraph has two verses and the second five verses. The two paragraphs constitute two עליות, which can be divided in one of two ways:

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| (1) First עליה | Exodus 16:4-8 | 2 & 3 verses |
| Second עליה | Exodus 16:8-10 | 3 verses |

or perhaps preferably:

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| (1) First עליה | Exodus 16:4-8 | 2 & 3 verses |
| Second עליה | Exodus 16:6-10 | 5 verses |

In סדר 93, the first paragraph has 4 verses, the second paragraph has 8 verses and the third 11 verses. These 23 verses are best divided as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|----------|
| (1) First עליה | Leviticus 25:35-38 | 4 verses |
| (2) Second עליה | Leviticus 25:39-43 | 5 verses |
| (3) Third עליה | Leviticus 25:44-46 | 3 verses |
| (4) Fourth עליה | Leviticus 25:47-49 | 3 verses |
| (5) Fifth עליה | Leviticus 25:50-52 | 3 verses |
| (6) Sixth עליה | Leviticus 25:53-55 | 3 verses |
| (7) Seventh עליה | Leviticus 25:56-26:2 | 3 verses |

Of the three סדרים divided into 4 masoretic paragraphs, none has paragraphs with four or five verses. סדר 52, does however, have a

paragraph with only one verse. While the first two paragraphs can each be divided into two עליות (4 + 4 verses and 3 + 3 verses), the last two paragraphs require some repetition of verses for the appropriate distribution of verses by content.

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------|
| (1) Fifth עליה | Exodus 12:43-47 | 5 verses |
| (2) Sixth עליה | Exodus 12:48-50 | 3 verses |
| (3) Seventh עליה | Exodus 12:48-51 | 4 verses |

סדר 118, which contains five masoretic paragraphs, includes two with five verses each. However, the second paragraph has 9 verses and can be divided into three עליות, each with 3 verses, the fourth paragraph has six verses and can be divided into two עליות, again each with 3 verses and the last paragraph has 3 verses which constitutes one עליה.

סדר 147 consists of 23 verses divided into eight masoretic paragraphs. One of these paragraphs has only one verse, 3 have two verses each, two have three verses each, one, four verses and one six verses. It is clear that some repetition will be necessary in order to divide the סדר into seven עליות. The following division is suggested:

- | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|----------|
| (1) First עליה | Deuteronomy 24:19-22 | 4 verses |
| (2) Second עליה | Deuteronomy 25:1-3 | 3 verses |
| (3) Third עליה | Deuteronomy 25:4-7 | 4 verses |
| (4) Fourth עליה | Deuteronomy 25:8-10 | 3 verses |
| (5) Fifth עליה | Deuteronomy 25:11-16 | 6 verses |
| (6) Sixth עליה | Deuteronomy 25:13-16 | 4 verses |
| (7) Seventh עליה | Deuteronomy 25:17-19 | 3 verses |

סדר 42, the blessing of Jacob, consists of 27 verses divided into eleven masoretic paragraphs. Five of these paragraphs have only one verse each, 2 paragraphs gave 3 verses each, 3 paragraphs 5 verses each, while the remaining 2 paragraphs have two and four verses respectively. The עליות should be divided as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------|------------------|----------|
| (1) First עליה | Genesis 49:1-4 | 4 verses |
| (2) Second עליה | Genesis 49:5-7 | 3 verses |
| (3) Third עליה | Genesis 49:8-12 | 5 verses |
| (4) Fourth עליה | Genesis 49:13-15 | 3 verses |
| (5) Fifth עליה | Genesis 49:16-18 | 3 verses |
| (6) Sixth עליה | Genesis 49:19-21 | 3 verses |
| (7) Seventh עליה | Genesis 49:22-27 | 6 verses |

סדר 86, the laws of illicit sexual relations (ערייות), includes 11 paragraphs each with one verse, one paragraph with 5 verses and one with fourteen. The content of this סדר may appear offensive to our sensitivities since it deals entirely with incest, bestiality, human sacrifice to Molekh and the concomitant punishment for violation of these prohibitions. Nonetheless, if our sensitivities are set aside, there is no inherent difficulty in dividing these 30 verses into seven עליות.

סדר 146, a series of miscellaneous laws from Deuteronomy, consists of 23 verses divided into twelve paragraphs. Six of these paragraphs consist of only one verse, three paragraphs each have two verses, one has three verses and two paragraphs again each have four verses. Here again the division of these verses into seven עליות will require a certain amount of repetition.

(1) First עליה	Deuteronomy 23:22-24	3 verses
(2) Second עליה	Deuteronomy 23:25-24:4	6 verses
(3) Third עליה	Deuteronomy 24:5-8	4 verses
(4) Fourth עליה	Deuteronomy 24:9-13	5 verses
(5) Fifth עליה	Deuteronomy 24:10-13	4 verses
(6) Sixth עליה	Deuteronomy 24:14-16	3 verses
(7) Seventh עליה	Deuteronomy 24:16-18	3 verses

From the above discussion a number of conclusions appear obvious. First, there was a conscientious effort on the part of those who established the סדרים to limit the number of short סדרים (only 11 have fewer than 21 verses; only 36 have from 21 to 30 verses). Second, those סדרים with 21 to 30 verses are made predominantly of one or two masoretic paragraphs. Furthermore, of those short סדרים made up of three or more paragraphs, 10 of the sixteen can be divided into seven עליות without repeating verses and without dividing paragraphs of four or five verses. Of the six סדרים that do require repetition of verses to constitute seven עליות, one (סדר 93) repeats only one verse, a second (סדר 92) repeats two verses, two others (סדרים 52 and 55) each repeat three verses, סדר 147 repeats 4 verses and סדר 146 repeats a maximum of five verses. Finally, it should be realized that if one wished to make additional עליות, especially in those סדרים with less than 30 verses, wholesale repetition of עליות would almost undoubtedly be necessary.

The other three halakhic requirements summarized above on page 10 are also equally well met by the Palestinian triennial cycle. The Torah is read and taught in order from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. Only the festivals, fast days, New Moon and special Shabbatot depart from the order, a departure mandated by the Mishnah and the *Tosefta*. The עליות read at Shabbat מנחה, and on Monday and Thursday constitute the first three עליות for the following Shabbat morning. And finally, the last סדרים for each of the five books of the Torah provide sufficient verses to constitute seven עליות:

Genesis	סדר 43	31 verses
Exodus	סדר 72	49 verses
Leviticus	סדר 94	44 verses
Numbers	סדר 127	39 verses
Deuteronomy	סדר 154	41 verses

One last halakhic criterion must be considered before concluding a discussion on the virtues of the Palestinian triennial cycle. This criterion is the desideratum of following the מנהג of beginning and ending each reading on a good note. Rambam⁶⁰ applies the מנהג to the beginning and ending of each עליה

כל העולה לקרות בתורה פותח בדבר טוב ומסיים בדבר טוב.

The Rama⁶¹ is more vague in his application of the מנהג.

ויכוין שיתחיל תמיד לקרוא בדבר טוב ויסיים בדבר טוב.

While it is probable the Rama intends the מנהג to be applied for each and every עליה, it is possible that the intention is that it be applied only to the beginning and ending of a complete Shabbat or festival lection.

In applying this particular customary halakhic criterion to the Palestinian triennial cycle, we must remember that the earliest reference to beginning and ending on a positive note is 51. There is thus no reason to assume that such a custom was applied rigidly in the Palestinian triennial cycle. Moreover, what constitutes a good note or bad note is clearly a subjective decision.

Realizing the subjectivity of what constitutes a good note or a bad note, Table III attempts to evaluate whether the Palestinian סדרים were divided with this subjective criterion in mind. The Table rates opening and closing verses of a סדר on the following scale:⁶²

- | | |
|-----|-----------|
| (1) | Positive |
| (2) | Neutral + |
| (3) | Neutral |
| (4) | Neutral – |
| (5) | Negative |

Moreover, it indicates by a Yes or a No whether the last verse of a סדר corresponds to the closing verse of an עליה from the annual reading of the Torah.

Of the 154 סדרים, 100 end at the closing verse of an עליה from the annual cycle and two more end at the closing verse of an עליה from the Shabbat מנחה reading. Of the 100 סדרים that begin at the first verse of an עליה of the annual cycle, 65 begin on a positive note, while only five⁶³ begin on a distinctly negative note. The other 30 are neutral, with only four of these 30 being on the negative side of neutral. Similarly, of the 100 סדרים whose last verse corresponds to the last verse of an עליה of the annual cycle, 69 end on a distinctly positive note, while again only 5 end on a distinctly negative note.⁶⁴ The other 26 are neutral, with only 5 being rated on the negative side of neutral.

Of the 54 סדרים whose first verse does not correspond to the first verse of an עליה from the annual cycle, 34 begin on a distinctly positive note,

while 5 begin on a distinctly negative note.⁶⁵ The other 15 are neutral, with four of these fifteen being on the negative side of neutral. The positive first verses account for 63% of all the first verses in these 54 סדרים, which corresponds quite well with the 65% of positive opening verses, where the opening verses are identical to the first verse of an עליה from the annual cycle. The negative first verses account for 9.25% of all the first verses in these 54 סדרים, almost twice as many as negative first verses where the first verse is identical to the first verse of an עליה of the annual cycle.

Of the 54 סדרים whose last verse does not correspond to the last verse of an עליה from the annual cycle, only 19 end on a distinctly positive note, while 15⁶⁶ end on a distinctly negative note. The other 20 are neutral, with four of these twenty being on the negative side of neutral. The positive verses account for only 35% of all concluding verses in these 54 סדרים compared with 69% of positive concluding verses, where the concluding verses are identical to the concluding verse of an עליה from the annual cycle. The negative concluding verses account for 27.75% of all concluding verses, better than five times the number of negative concluding verses when the concluding verse of a סדר is identical to the concluding verse of an עליה from the annual cycle.

While the above analysis makes it clear that those who divided the *Torah* into עליות and פרשיות for the annual cycle attempted to adhere to the principle of beginning and ending each עליה on a positive note and to abjure from beginning and ending of a negative note, those who divided the *Torah* into סדרים, to the extent that the principle of a good note existed at all, were much more conscientious about beginning a סדר on a good note than ending on a good note. By extrapolation, since we have no record of how the סדרים were divided into עליות, we might posit that where possible the preference should be given to beginning an עליה on a positive note over ending an עליה on a positive note. Given the number of סדרים with less than 30 verses, this preference for beginning עליות on a positive note may in fact be no more than an ideal to be strived for but all too often impossible to achieve.

Do Either of the Current Practices in Conservative Congregations Have a Degree of Halakhic Legitimacy, in Light of the Halakhic Data Analyzed Above?

1) Modified Annual Cycle

At the beginning of this paper, I outlined what appear to be two current practices of our congregations regarding abbreviating the weekly Torah

reading. One, wherein the *לוי עליה* is read at Shabbat *מנחה*, the *לוי עליה* on Monday mornings, *שלישי* on Thursday mornings, and the balance of the *פרשה* is read on Shabbat morning is in reality not a triennial cycle at all, but a modified annual cycle. In spite of the fact that this modified annual cycle is referred to in the CJLS archives as “distorted,” it in fact has a basis in the classical literature. *Tosefta Megillah* 3:10 in fact actually proposes such a procedure for reading the Torah (see above page 8). This section of the *baraita* is actually stated anonymously in the *Tosefta* but is cited in the name of R. Meir in the Bavli.⁶⁷ The Bavli goes on to reject this procedure and R. Zera codifies the procedure stated in the name of R. Yehudah in the same *Tosefta*, which is the procedure for reading the Torah according to a pure annual cycle still in use today.

What is significant is that the anonymous *רישא* of the *Tosefta* is an unimpeachable tannaitic source. Lieberman, in his edition of *Tosefta Moed*,⁶⁸ gives no significant variants in the critical apparatus. Since many of our decisions on the Committee of Jewish Law and Standards are based on individual opinions (*דעת יחיד*) which were never incorporated into standard bodies of halakhah and in some cases explicitly rejected in the standard bodies of halakhah (e.g., women in a *minyan*, *עליות* for women), it seems wise to accept the modified annual cycle as a legitimate alternative for those congregations who wish to abbreviate the Shabbat morning Torah lection, yet wish to complete the reading of the Torah in one year. This option presupposes that such congregations conduct a *minyan* at Shabbat *מנחה* and Monday and Thursday mornings and that if Monday or Thursday happen to be *Rosh Hodesh*, the additional *עליה* not read during the week would be read on Shabbat morning. Moreover, such a modified cycle need not be applied rigidly. Thus, if the *לוי עליה* is especially long, it could be divided between the Monday and Thursday readings. Such decisions are appropriately left to the *mara d'atra*, provided, as Rabbi Harlow pointed out in his correspondence from 1961, that (a) three people are called to the Torah on Shabbat *מנחה*, Monday and Thursday mornings; (b) each person reads at least three verses; (c) a total of at least ten verses are read; and equally importantly, that the reading continue sequentially from Shabbat *מנחה* to Monday morning and from Monday to Thursday morning and from Thursday morning to Shabbat *shaharit*, as stipulated by the *Tosefta*.

The second practice, the first proposed by Rabbi Edward Sandrow and later modified and expanded by Rabbi Barry Dov Lerner, does not, on the other hand, meet one significant halakhic requirement. *Mishnah Megillah* 4:4 states emphatically “*אין מדלגין בתורה*” While this phrase was understood by the Bavli, the commentators on Mishnah and Talmud and by the *poskim* to mean skipping from one issue to another, either to

avoid confusing the reader or to avoid troubling the congregation (טרחא דציבורא) while the Torah is being rolled, (see above, page 7), *Yerushalmi Megillah* 4:5 provides a more literal and I believe sensible reason for not skipping around in the Torah. Moreover, the reason is pedagogically sound when it argues that the intention is to assure the orderly teaching of the Torah to Israel (כדי שישמעו את ישראל התורה על הסדר).

2) Modified Triennial Cycle

A Torah reading cycle that divides an annual פרשה over three years not only interrupts the orderly teaching of Torah, but fragmentizes such lengthy narratives as the Joseph story, the Exodus, the building of the Tabernacle, to name but a few, into meaningless literary units, isolated from their context for a period of twelve months. Its only dubious advantage is that all synagogues will be reading from the same annual פרשה on the same week and the cycle of readings will arbitrarily be completed in three years. Considering its pedagogical and literary disadvantages, this well-intentioned but truly distorted and misguided system should be phased out or eliminated outright from the liturgical practices of our congregations.

One disadvantage of all abbreviated Torah readings is that synagogue guests will be surprised by what is being read or not read. Furthermore, those synagogues that adopt a modified annual cycle have the additional disadvantage that the vast majority of the congregation of regular Shabbat worshippers will never hear the first three עליות read earlier in the week. While these disadvantages might be factors which discourage congregations from using either the Palestinian triennial cycle or the modified annual cycle, they can be overcome and remedied. Rabbis choosing the modified annual cycle should encourage their members to read the Torah lection for the week privately at home as required by the Bavli:

לעולם ישלים אדם פרשיותיו עם הצבור שנים מקרא ואחד תרגום⁶⁹

A person should complete the *Parasha* of the week read by the community twice in Hebrew and once in *targum* (translation).

As for those guests visiting a synagogue using the Palestinian triennial cycle, they should publicly follow the reading of the synagogue and privately read the appropriate פרשה of the annual cycle.⁷⁰

What Prophetic Selections Should We Use for the *Haftarat* of a Triennial Cycle?

Adolph Buchler, in his seminal articles in *J.Q.R.*⁷¹ was the first to publish a list of triennial הפטרות, based on the Genizah fragments. The list, republished by Mann,⁷² includes all the הפטרות for the סדרים from Genesis 5:2 to Leviticus 6:12 and indicates both the initial and concluding verse of each prophetic selection.

In preparing his list of Palestinian הפטרות, Mann had at his disposal several additional Genizah fragments than the one available to Buchler.⁷³ These fragments indicated the הפטרות for the first three סדרים of Genesis (Genesis 1:1-4:26), as well as הפטרות for סדרים 110 and 111 (Numbers 17:16-20:13) and for סדרים 130 through 136 (Deuteronomy 2:2-11:9). In addition, Mann had at his disposal the קרובות of Yannai published by Zulay. These קרובות quote the first verse of the Palestinian הפטרות.

Wacholder informs us of the incompleteness of Mann's study, because of the latter's untimely death.⁷⁴ While there are still scholarly desiderata in identifying triennial הפטרות from Genizah fragments still in the collections of Oxford, Cambridge and Leningrad, Wacholder published an almost complete list of הפטרות for the triennial cycle.⁷⁵ The list collates all the sources of data available to Wacholder – Genizah fragments, קרובות – and shows where the Palestinian הפטרות correspond to those of Roumanian, Karaite, Ashkenazic and Sephardic rites respectively. The weakness with Wacholder's chart is that it only indicates the first verse of each הפטרה. Moreover, many of the הפטרות, especially those for סדרים in Numbers and Deuteronomy where appropriate Genizah fragments have not been found are simply the product of "scholarly speculation." Since Wacholder never discusses the sources for these הפטרות or the principles by which he selects them, we are left to conclude that they have no more validity than the imagination that produced them.

Even those הפטרות discussed in some detail by Mann are subject to some skepticism. Mann operated from the premise that "as a rule the prophetic lection consisted of 10 verses, though sometimes 11 verses are given or 9 or 8." Mann also noted the interesting feature of skipping verses in the triennial cycle הפטרות, in order to conclude the הפטרה on a "happy note." Thus the tenth verse, according to Mann, is sometimes added after leaving out an intervening prophetic portion, in consonance with the Mishnah's ruling, מדלגין דנביא. Mann observed that very frequently the biblical codices contain the siglum S = סדר either at the verse where the הפטרה begins or where it ends; moreover, the concluding verse with the "happy ending" added after the skipping, often coincides with the verse having the siglum.⁷⁶

While it is true that the Genizah fragments do in fact indicate הפטרות of only 10 verses and do indicate skipping, that is, omitting an intermediate section in order to end on a positive note, it is also true that the Genizah fragments indicate הפטרות with more than ten verses and without skipping.⁷⁷ Mann, however, applied his premises rigidly and thus invented wholesale skipping of verses in order to reduce a longer הפטרה to 10 or 11 verses.⁷⁸

One observation by Mann is, however, more accurately born out by the hard data. Mann observed that in the choice of a particular הפטרה for a given Torah selection, the principle of *tallying* was predominantly operative; that is, there had to be either linguistic affinity or some intrinsic contextual connection between the initial verses of the סדר and the verses of the הפטרה.⁷⁹ Wacholder noted that the Palestinian הפטרות were strikingly eschatological in content, which he conjectures may mean that the הפטרה served as a sort of peroration in the same way as did the later midrashic הפטרה, which also conclude with messianic allusions. Wacholder argues that the messianic message was the most important feature of the Palestinian הפטרה which alone accounts for the excessive brevity (sometimes as short as two or three verses). This principle he claims also accounts for the observation that more than 75% of the Palestinian הפטרות are chosen from Isaiah (especially chapters 40 to 66) and the apocalyptic portions of the Minor Prophets, where prophecies of consolation containing messianic messages predominate.⁸⁰

What is obvious is that our knowledge of Palestinian הפטרות is more fragmentary than that of the Palestinian סדרים. Undoubtedly, there is good hard data available about the initial and concluding verses for the הפטרות of many Palestinian סדרים. What must be considered in more detail is whether skipping was the rule or only a liberally used option. Since lists of הפטרות are based on numerous Genizah fragments, the available fragments must be studied by specialists to determine which, if any, are related to each other and if the principle of skipping verses is characteristic of a family of manuscripts or endemic to all the fragments or limited to only one or two fragments. Moreover, since more than a third of the הפטרות listed by Wacholder are the product of “scholarly speculation,” additional research will be necessary to identify other Genizah fragments that supply the missing data. A forthcoming new edition of *Piyyutei Yannai* edited by Z.W. Rabinowitz may provide additional data on at least the first verses of הפטרות for the סדרים in Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Since a responsum is supposed to be at least as pragmatic as it is scholarly, we must address the question of which prophetic selection should be used. Where the data is hard, there is of course no difficulty in determining where a הפטרה begins and where it ends. Unless, the sources

explicitly indicate that certain verses are to be skipped, the entire passage (usually not more than twenty or twenty-one verses) should be recited. Where no hard data exists, and the initial verses of the הפטרה are the product apparently of Wacholder's scholarly speculation, the passage should be checked to determine:

(1) if there is linguistic or contextual tallying between the Torah lection and the proposed הפטרה;

(2) if the proposed הפטרה is eschatological-desirable but not necessary;

(3) if the הפטרה can end on a positive note after a minimum of 10 verses and a maximum of 20 to 25 verses.

If such an arbitrary הפטרה meets the above criteria, then it could be used until such time as the scholarly world discovers the necessary hard data.

Should *Simḥat Torah* be Celebrated Annually by those who Complete the Reading of the Torah on a Triennial Cycle or Only When the Torah Reading is Completed?

It is almost universally accepted that *Simḥat Torah* is a gaonic festival of Babylonian provenience. No reference is made to such a festival in the Babylonian Talmud and the earliest references are in the responsa of the Babylonian *Geonim*.⁸¹ As we noted in an earlier part of this paper (see above page 4), the *חילוקים* indicate that while Babylonian Jewry celebrates *Simḥat Torah* annually, the Palestinian Jews celebrate it every three and a half years.⁸² On the other hand, a much later and perhaps less reliable source than the *חילוקים*, namely Benjamin of Tuleda, claims that those who worshipped in the Palestinian synagogue in Fustat joined those who worshipped in the Babylonian synagogue for the annual celebration of *Simḥat Torah*.⁸³ That is almost all we know about the celebration of *Simḥat Torah* among Palestinian Jewry.

Simḥat Torah, among those who read a triennial cycle of Torah readings, accordingly occurred on whatever particular Shabbat coincided with the reading of *וזאת הברכה*. According to *Kohelet Rabbah*, beginning of Chapter I, R. Isaac taught that one makes a *סעודה*, a festal meal, when one finishes reading the Torah. Margulies interprets this passage to mean simply that Palestinian Jews prepared a *סעודה סיום* in much the same manner as we do when we finish a tractate of Talmud.⁸⁴

We also noted above (see page 6 and footnotes 32 and 33) that Joseph Heinemann postulated that there is no possibility to assume that the triennial cycle of reading began and concluded at a fixed season.⁸⁵ Using a פיוט for “the Sabbath *וזאת הברכה* of ישראל” found in a manuscript from the Taylor Schechter Collection H12/11, Ezra Fleisher confirmed

Heinemann's postulate.⁸⁶ The פיוט, a *shivata*, follows directly a list of laws and פיוטים for both the evening and morning service of *Simḥat Torah*. On the basis of the juxtaposition of *Simḥat Torah* with the Shabbat of וזאת הברכה of ארץ ישראל, Fleischer concludes that the two terms are parallel. Fleischer further concludes that this Shabbat was not fixed with regard to its position in the calendar and it was equally possible for it to occur in winter as in summer.⁸⁷ This פיוט adds further proof to the authenticity of the midrash collection to וזאת הברכה in *Pesikta de Rav Kahana*.⁸⁸ Just as the Shabbat for concluding the Torah was worthy of special ornamentation through special פיוטים, it also occasioned special homilies. Fleischer argues that the fact that these homilies occur at the end of the midrash collection indicates that they are intended for a Shabbat that occurs only one in three or so years whose date is not fixed. Even the content of the homilies, the death of Moses and the absence of any reference to the festival of *Simḥat Torah* as it was celebrated in the Diaspora, further indicates that the homilies were intended for a Shabbat whose date was not fixed.

With all this data, limited as it may be, we must draw some practical conclusions. As questionable as Benjamin of Tudela may be as an accurate and factual observer for history, to say nothing of halakhah, his observation that the Jews of the Palestinian synagogue joined those of the Babylonian on *Simḥat Torah* bears some importance. Since most Diaspora Conservative congregations observe יום טוב שני של גלויות, it seems appropriate that the second day of *Shemini Atzeret* be observed as *Simḥat Torah* even by those synagogues following a triennial cycle of readings. The distinctive reading for this יום טוב would remain Deuteronomy 33:1-34:12 (וזאת הברכה), the מפטיר, Numbers 29:35-40 (ביום שמיני) and the הפטרה, Joshua 1:1-18. The only distinction for congregations following a triennial cycle would be the omission of the חתן בראשית, since the reading on the Shabbat following *Simḥat Torah* would rarely, if ever be Genesis 1:1 ff. The purpose of this celebration of *Simḥat Torah* in those synagogues following the triennial cycle would be to rejoice with the Torah, to express our delight in our unique heritage, through song and dance and the annualized opportunity for every member of the congregation to receive an עליה.

Additionally, congregations adopting the triennial cycle, should give special significance to the Shabbat on which they in fact finish reading the Torah. Minimally, as Margulies suggests, there should be a special meal or קדוש. More elaborate celebrations might include adapting some of the distinctive aspects of the Babylonian *Simḥat Torah*, including the designation of a חתן/כלה התורה and a חתן/כלה בראשית, the use of the lengthy פיוטים to call those honorees to the Torah and even the introduction of the expanded service for removing the Torah (אתה הראת

לדעת) and the seven הקפות and the attendant dancing. While the minimalist approach would certainly fulfill the traditional customary requirements, the author favors the maximalist approach, there being far too few opportunities for communal celebration and rejoicing.

CONCLUSION

This paper has been an attempt to set a liturgical innovation of our movement in a halakhic framework. I believe that it at once retains the initial thrust of those communities who, more than 1000 years ago, read the Torah over a three year period, while retaining the desire of our colleagues and their congregants to read shorter, but intelligent literary units of the Torah on each Shabbat. There are still several practical decisions that must be undertaken:

(1) the division of each of the 154 סדרים into seven עליות which are also intelligible literary units.

(2) the assigning of a distinct prophetic portion or הפטרה to each סדר.

(3) the development of an extended calendar of up to 100 years on which the individual סדרים are read.

And at a scholarly level, there is still the need to comb the literally tens of thousands of unpublished Genizah fragments for more solid data regarding the original הפטרות which were attached to the סדרים in much of the book of Numbers and most of Deuteronomy.

Above all, it is the hope of the author that the practical result of the adoption of this triennial cycle will be להגדיל תורה להאדירה, to magnify the Torah and to make it more honored.

TABLE I

Summary of the Number of verses in סדרים

Seder 1	Gen. 1:1 – 2:3	34 verses
Seder 2	Gen. 2:4 – 3:21	43 verses
Seder 3	Gen. 3:22 – 4:26	29 verses
Seder 4	Gen. 5:1 – 6:8	40 verses
Seder 5	Gen. 6:9 – 8:14	52 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 5a	Gen. 6:9 – 7:24	38 verses
Seder 5b	Gen. 8:1 – 8:14	14 verses
Seder 6	Gen. 8:15 – 9:17	25 verses
<i>Variation:</i>		
Seder 6a	Gen. 8:1 – 9:17	38 verses
Seder 7	Gen. 9:18 – 11:32	76 verses

Variations:

Seder 7a	Gen. 9:18 – 10:32	44 verses
Seder 7b	Gen. 11:1 – 12:9	41 verses
Seder 8	Gen. 12:1 – 9	9 verses

Variation:

Seder 8a	Gen. 12:1 – 13:18	38 verses
Seder 9	Gen. 12:10 – 13:18	39 verses
Seder 10	Gen. 14:1 – 24	24 verses
Seder 11	Gen. 15:1 – 21	21 verses
Seder 12	Gen. 16:1 – 16	16 verses
Seder 13	Gen. 17:1 – 27	27 verses
Seder 14	Gen. 18:1 – 33	33 verses
Seder 15	Gen. 19:1 – 38	38 verses
Seder 16	Gen. 20:1 – 18	18 verses
Seder 17	Gen. 21:1 – 33	33 verses
Seder 18	Gen. 22:1 – 23:20	44 verses
Seder 19	Gen. 24:1 – 41	41 verses
Seder 20	Gen. 24:42 – 67	26 verses
Seder 21	Gen. 25:1 – 18	18 verses
Seder 22	Gen. 25:19 – 26:35	51 verses

Variations:

Seder 22a	Gen. 26:12 – 35	24 verses
Seder 23	Gen. 27:1 – 27	27 verses
Seder 24	Gen. 27:28 – 28:9	28 verses
Seder 25	Gen. 28:10 – 29:30	43 verses
Seder 26	Gen. 29:31 – 30:21	26 verses
Seder 27	Gen. 30:22 – 31:2	24 verses
Seder 28	Gen. 31:3 – 32:3	55 verses
Seder 29	Gen. 32:4 – 33:17	47 verses
Seder 30	Gen. 33:18 – 35:8	42 verses
Seder 31	Gen. 35:9 – 36:43	64 verses
Seder 32	Gen. 37:1 – 36	36 verses
Seder 33	Gen. 38:1 – 30	30 verses
Seder 34	Gen. 39:1 – 40:23	46 verses

Variations:

Seder 34a	Gen. 39:1 – 23	23 verses
Seder 34b	Gen. 40:1 – 23	23 verses
Seder 35	Gen. 41:1 – 37	37 verses

Variations:

Seder 35a	Gen. 40:1 – 41:37	60 verses
Seder 36	Gen. 41:38 – 42:17	37 verses

Variations:

Seder 36a	Gen. 42:1 – 17	17 verses
-----------	----------------	-----------

Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?

Seder 37	Gen. 42:18 – 43:13	34 verses
Seder 38	Gen. 43:14 – 44:17	38 verses
Seder 39	Gen. 44:18 – 46:23 ⁷	72 verses
Seder 40	Gen. 46:28 – 47:31	38 verses
Seder 41	Gen. 48:1 – 22	22 verses
Seder 42	Gen. 49:1 – 27	27 verses
Seder 43	Gen. 49:28 – 50:26	31 verses
Seder 44	Ex. 1:1 – 2:25	47 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 44a	Ex. 1:1 – 22	22 verses
Seder 44b	Ex. 2:1 – 25	25 verses
Seder 45	Ex. 3:1 – 4:17	39 verses
Seder 46	Ex. 4:18 – 6:1	38 verses
Seder 47	Ex. 6:2 – 7:7	36 verses
Seder 48	Ex. 7:8 – 8:15	37 verses
Seder 49	Ex. 8:16 – 9:35	48 verses
Seder 50	Ex. 10:1 – 29	29 verses
Seder 51	Ex. 11:1 – 12:28	38 verses
Seder 52	Ex. 12:29 – 51	23 verses
Seder 53	Ex. 13:1 – 14:14	36 verses
Seder 54	Ex. 14:15 – 16:3	47 verses
Seder 55	Ex. 16:4 – 27	24 verses
Seder 56	Ex. 16:28 – 17:16	25 verses
Seder 57	Ex. 18:1 – 19:5	32 verses
Seder 58	Ex. 19:6 – 20:26	46 verses
Seder 59	Ex. 21:1 – 22:23	60 verses
Seder 60	Ex. 22:24 – 24:18	58 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 60a	Ex. 22:24 – 23:19	26 verses
Seder 60b	Ex. 23:20 – 24:18	32 verses
Seder 61	Ex. 25:1 – 40	40 verses
Seder 62	Ex. 26:1 – 30	30 verses
Seder 63	Ex. 26:31 – 27:19	26 verses
Seder 64	Ex. 27:20 – 28:43	45 verses
Seder 65	Ex. 29:1 – 46	46 verses
Seder 66	Ex. 30:1 – 38	38 verses
Seder 67	Ex. 31:1 – 32:14	32 verses
Seder 68	Ex. 32:15 – 34:26	70 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 68a	Ex. 32:15 – 33:23	44 verses
Seder 68b	Ex. 34:1 – 26	26 verses
Seder 69	Ex. 34:27 – 36:38	82 verses

Variations:

Seder 69a	Ex. 34:27 – 35:35	44 verses
Seder 69b	Ex. 36:1 – 38	38 verses
Seder 70	Ex. 37:1 – 38:20	49 verses
Seder 71	Ex. 38:21 – 39:32	43 verses
Seder 72	Ex. 39:33 – 40:38	49 verses
Seder 73	Lev. 1:1 – 3:17	50 verses

Variations

Seder 73a	Lev. 1:1 – 5:13	98 verses
Seder 74	Lev. 4:1 – 6:11	72 verses

Variations:

Seder 74a	Lev. 4:1 – 35	35 verses
Seder 74b	Lev. 5:1 – 6:11	37 verses
Seder 74c	Lev. 5:14 – 6:11	23 verses
Seder 75	Lev. 6:12 – 7:38	50 verses
Seder 76	Lev. 8:1 – 10:7	67 verses
Seder 77	Lev. 10:8 – 20	13 verses
Seder 78	Lev. 11:1 – 47	47 verses
Seder 79	Lev. 12:1 – 13:28	36 verses
Seder 80	Lev. 13:29 – 59	31 verses
Seder 81	Lev. 14:1 – 32	32 verses
Seder 82	Lev. 14:33 – 57	25 verses
Seder 83	Lev. 15:1 – 24	24 verses
Seder 84	Lev. 15:25 – 16:34	43 verses
Seder 85	Lev. 17:1 – 16	16 verses
Seder 86	Lev. 18:1 – 30	30 verses
Seder 87	Lev. 19:1 – 22	22 verses
Seder 88	Lev. 19:23 – 20:27	42 verses
Seder 89	Lev. 21:1 – 22:16	40 verses
Seder 90	Lev. 22:17 – 23:14	31 verses

Variations:

Seder 90a	Lev. 22:17 – 23:8	25 verses
Seder 91	Lev. 23:15 – 25:13	66 verses

Variations:

Seder 91a	Lev. 23:15 – 44	30 verses
Seder 91b	Lev. 24:1 – 25:13	36 verses
Seder 92	Lev. 25:14 – 34	21 verses
Seder 93	Lev. 25:35 – 26:2	23 verses
Seder 94	Lev. 26:3 – 46	44 verses
Seder 95	Lev. 27:1 – 34	34 verses
Seder 96	Num. 1:1 – 54	54 verses
Seder 97	Num. 2:1 – 34	34 verses
Seder 98	Num. 3:1 – 4:16	67 verses

Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?

Seder 99	Num. 4:17 – 5:10	43 verses
Seder 100	Num. 5:11 – 6:21	42 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 100a	Num. 5:11 – 31	21 verses
Seder 100b	Num. 6:1 – 21	21 verses
Seder 101	Num. 6:22 – 7:47	53 verses
Seder 102	Num. 7:48 – 89	42 verses
Seder 103	Num. 8:1 – 9:23	49 verses
Seder 104	Num. 10:1 – 11:15	51 verses
Seder 105	Num. 11:16 – 11:22	7 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 105a	Num. 11:16 – 12:16	36 verses
Seder 106	Num. 11:23 – 12:16	29 verses
Seder 107	Num. 13:1 – 14:10	43 verses
Seder 108	Num. 14:11 – 45	35 verses
Seder 109	Num. 15:1 – 41	41 verses
Seder 110	Num. 16:1 – 17:15	50 verses
Seder 111	Num. 17:16 – 18:24	37 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 111a	Num. 17:16 – 18:32	45 verses
Seder 112	Num. 18:25 – 20:13	43 verses
<i>Variation</i>		
Seder 112a	Num. 19:1 – 20:13	35 verses
Seder 113	Num. 20:14 – 22:1	52 verses
Seder 114	Num. 22:2 – 23:9	50 verses
Seder 115	Num. 23:10 – 24:25	46 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 115a	Num. 23:10 – 25:9	54 verses
Seder 116	Num. 25:1 – 9	9 verses
Seder 117	Num. 25:10 – 26:51	60 verses
Seder 118	Num. 26:52 – 27:14	28 verses
Seder 119	Num. 27:15 – 28:25	33 verses
Seder 120	Num. 28:26 – 30:1	46 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 121a	Num. 30:2 – 31:24	40 verses
Seder 122	Num. 31:1 – 24	24 verses
Seder 123	Num. 31:25 – 54	30 verses
Seder 124	Num. 32:1 – 42	42 verses
Seder 125	Num. 33:1 – 56	56 verses
Seder 126	Num. 34:1 -35:8	37 verses
Seder 127	Num. 35:9 – 36:13	39 verses
Seder 128	Deut 1:1 – 2:1	47 verses
Seder 129	Deut. 2:2 – 2:30	29 verses

Seder 130	Deut. 2:31 – 3:22	29 verses
Seder 131	Deut. 3:23 – 4:40	47 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 131a	Deut. 3:23 – 4:24	31 verses
Seder 131b	Deut. 4:25 – 4:40	16 verses
Seder 132	Deut. 4:41 – 6:3	45 verses
Seder 133	Deut. 6:4 – 7:11	33 verses
Seder 134	Deut. 7:12 – 8:20	35 verses
Seder 135	Deut. 9:1 – 29	29 verses
Seder 136	Deut. 10:1 – 11:9	31 verses
Seder 137	Deut. 11:10 – 12:19	42 verses
Seder 138	Deut. 12:20 – 13:19	31 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 138a	Deut. 12:20 – 13:1	13 verses
Seder 138b	Deut. 13:2 – 19	18 verses
Seder 139	Deut. 14:1 – 15:6	35 verses
Seder 140	Deut. 15:7 – 16:17	34 verses
Seder 141	Deut. 16:18 – 17:13	17 verses
Seder 142	Deut. 17:14 – 20:9	59 verses
<i>Variations</i>		
Seder 142a	Deut. 17:14 – 18:13	20 verses
Seder 142b	Deut. 18:14 – 20:9	39 verses
Seder 143	Deut. 20:10 – 22:5	39 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 143a	Deut. 20:10 – 21:9	20 verses
Seder 143b	Deut. 21:10 – 22:5	19 verses
Seder 144	Deut 22:6 – 23:9	33 verses
Seder 145	Deut. 23:10 – 21	11 verses
Seder 146	Deut. 23:22 – 24:18	23 verses
Seder 147	Deut. 24:19 – 25:19	23 verses
Seder 148	Deut. 26:1 – 27:26	45 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 148a	Deut. 26:1 – 28:14	59 verses
Seder 149	Deut 28:1 – 29:8	77 verses
<i>Variations:</i>		
Seder 149a	Deut. 28:15 – 29:8	63 verses
Seder 150	Deut. 29:9 – 30:10	30 verses
Seder 151	Deut. 30:11 – 31:13	23 verses
Seder 152	Deut. 31:14 – 30	17 verses
Seder 153	Deut. 32:1 – 52	52 verses
Seder 154	Deut. 33:1 – 34:12	41 verses

TABLE II

Analysis of סדרים With Under 30 Verses

Sigla:

Roman numerals indicate the number of masoretic paragraphs in the seder.

P = פרשה פתוחה

S = פרשה סתומה

X = indicates that the seder either begins or ends in the middle of a Masoretic paragraph.

For example. Seder 10/Gen. 14:1-24/I P 14:1-24 S/24 verses, means that Seder 10 consists of one masoretic paragraph, with Genesis 14:1 starting anew פרשה פתוחה, and verses 24 completing a masoretic paragraph followed by a פרשה סתומה. After each masoretic paragraph, we include the number of verses in the paragraph, as an aid to dividing each paragraph and the total seder into 7 עליות.

Seder 3	Gen. 3:22 – 4:26 פרשיות	I P 3:22 – 25 II S 4:1-26 P	29 verses 3 verses 26 verses
Seder 6	Gen. 8:15 – 9:17 פרשיות	I S 8:15 – 9:7 II S 9:8 – 9:17 P	25 verses 15 verses 10 verses
Seder 10	Gen. 14:1 – 24 פרשיות	I P 14:1 – 24 S	24 verses 24 verses
Seder 11	Gen. 15:1 – 21 פרשיות	I S 15:1 – 21 S	21 verses 21 verses
Seder 13	Gen. 17:1 – 27 פרשיות	I S 17:1 – 14 II A 17:15 – 27 P	27 verses 14 verses 13 verses
Seder 20	Gen 24:42 – 67 פרשיות	I X 24:42 – 67 P	26 verses 26 verses
Seder 23	Gen. 27:1 – 27 פרשיות	I S 27:1 – 27 X	27 verses 27 verses
Seder 24	Gen. 27:28 – 28:9 פרשיות	I X 27:28 – 28:9 S	28 verses 28 verses
Seder 26	Gen. 29:31 – 30:21 פרשיות	I X 29:31 – 30:21 X	26 verses 26 verses

Seder 27	Gen. 30:22 – 31:2 פרשיות	I X 30:21 – 31:2 X	24 verses 24 verses
Seder 33	Gen. 38:1 – 30 פרשיות	I P 38:1 – 30 S	30 verses 30 verses
Seder 41	Gen. 48:1 – 22 פרשיות	I P 48:1 – 22 P	22 verses 30 verses
Seder 42	Gen. 49:1 – 27 פרשיות	27 verses I P 49:1 – 4 II P 49:5 – 7 III P 49:8 – 12 IV P 49:13 V P 49:14 – 15 VI S 49:16 – 18 VII S 49:19 VIII S 49:20 IX S 49:21 X S 49:22 – 26 XI S 49:27 X	4 verses 3 verses 5 verses 1 verse 2 verses 3 verses 1 verse 1 verse 1 verse 5 verses 1 verses
Seder 50	Ex. 10:1 – 29 פרשיות	I P 10:1 – 11 II P 10:12 – 20 III P 10:21 – 29 P	29 verses 11 verses 9 verses 9 verses
Seder 52	Ex. 12:29 – 51 פרשיות	I S 12:29 – 36 II P 12:37 – 42 III P 12:43 – 50 IV S 12:51 P	23 verses 8 verses 6 verses 8 verses 1 verse
Seder 55	Ex. 16:4 – 27 פרשיות	I S 16:4 – 5 II S 16:6 – 10 III P 16:11 – 27 S	24 verses 2 verses 5 verses 17 verses
Seder 56	Ex. 16:28 – 17:16 פרשיות	I S 16:28 – 36 II P 17:1 – 7 III P 17:8 – 13 IV P 16:14 – 16 P	24 verses 9 verses 7 verses 6 verses 3 verses
Seder 62	Ex. 26:1 – 30 פרשיות	I S 26:1 – 6 II P 26:7 – 14 III P 26:15 – 30 S	30 verses 6 verses 8 verses 16 verses

Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?

Seder 63	Ex. 26:31 – 27:19 פרשיות	I S 26:31 – 37 II S 27:1 – 8 III S 27:9 – 19 S	26 verses 7 verses 8 verses 11 verses
Seder 82	Lev. 14:33 – 57 פרשיות	I P 14:33 – 57 P	25 verses 25 verses
Seder 83	Lev. 15:1 – 24 פרשיות	I P 15:1 – 15 II S 15:16 – 18 III P 15:19 – 24 S	24 verses 15 verses 3 verses 6 verses
Seder 86	Lev. 18:1 – 30 פרשיות	I P 18:1 – 5 II – XII S 18:6 – 16 XIII S 18:17 – 30 P	30 verses 5 verses 11x1 verse 14 verses
Seder 87	Lev. 19:1 – 22 פרשיות	I P 19:1 – 22 P	22 verses 22 verses
Seder 92	Lev. 25:14 – 34 פרשיות	I X 25:14 – 24 II S 25:25 – 34 S	21 verses 11 verses 10 verses
Seder 93	Lev. 25:35 – 26:2 פרשיות	I S 25:35 – 38 II S 25:39 – 46 III S 25:47 – 26:2 S	23 verses 4 verses 8 verses 11 verses
Seder 106 29 verses	Num. 11:23 – 12:16 פרשיות	I P 11:23 – 35 II P 12:1 – 3 III S 12:4 – 13 IV P 12:14 – 16 P	13 verses 3 verses 10 verses 3 verses
Seder 118 28 verses	Num. 26:52 – 27:14 פרשיות	I P 26:52 – 56 II P 26:57 – 65 III S 27:1 – 5 IV P 27:6 – 11 V P 27:12 – 14 S	5 verses 9 verses 5 verses 6 verses 3 verses
Seder 122	Num. 31:1 – 24 פרשיות	I P 31:1 – 12	24 verses 12 verses

		II S 31:13 – 20	8 verses
		III S 31:21 – 24 S	4 verses
Seder 123	Num. 31:25 – 54 פרשיות	I S 31:25 – 54 P	30 verses 30 verses
Seder 129	Deut. 2:2 – 30 פרשיות	I S 2:2 – 16 II S 2:17 – 30 S	29 verses 15 verses 14 verses
Seder 130	Deut. 2:31 – 3:22 פרשיות	I S 2:31 – 3:22 S	29 verses 29 verses
Seder 135	Deut. 9:1 – 29 פרשיות	I P 9:1 – 29 P	29 verses 29 verses
Seder 146	Deut. 23:22 – 24:18 פרשיות	I S 23:22 – 24 II S 23:25 III S 23:26 IV S 24:1 – 4 V – VI S 24:5 – 6 VII S 24:7 – 8 VIII S 24:9 IX S 24:10 – 13 X S 24:14 – 15 XI S 24:16 XII S 24:17 18 S	23 verses 3 verses 1 verse 1 verse 4 verses 2x1 verse 2 verses 1 verse 4 verses 2 verses 1 verse 2 verses
Seder 147	Deut. 24:19 – 25:19 פרשיות	I S 24:19 – 20 II S 24:21 – 22 III S 25:1 – 3 IV S 25:4 V S 22:5 – 10 VI S 25:11 – 12 VII S 25:13 – 16 VIII P 25:17 – 19 P	23 verses 2 verses 2 verses 3 verses 1 verse 6 verses 2 verses 4 verses 3 verses
Seder 150	Deut. 29:9 – 30:10 פרשיות	I P 29:9 – 28 II S 30:1 – 10 S	30 verses 20 verses 10 verses
Seder 151	Deut. 30:11 – 31:13 פרשיות	I S 30:11 – 20 II P 31:1 – 6 III S 31:7 – 13 P	23 verses 10 verses 6 verses 7 verses

TABLE III

Analysis of Whether סדרים Begin or End on a Positive Note

Sigla:

P = Verse introduces a Positive Theme.

N = Verse introduces a Negative Theme

Neutral = Verse introduces a Neutral Theme.

Neutral + = Verse introduces a Neutral theme which provides no morally positive or negative quality.

Neutral – = Verse introduces a Neutral theme which provides factual information with a somewhat negative quality.

Yes = The last verse of the *seder* corresponds to the last verse of an עליה in the annual cycle.

No = The last verse of the *seder* does not correspond to the last verse of an עליה in the annual cycle.

Y for S.M. = The last verse of the *seder* corresponds to the last verse of either the first or second עליה read at Shabbat מנחה in the annual cycle.

NOTES

1. *Megillah* 4:4.
2. Joseph Heinemann, *Tarbiz* 33 (1964), p. 362.
3. *Megillah* 29b.
4. The context of the *Gemara* is a discussion on why *Shekalim* must be announced on *Rosh Hodesh Adar*. After determining that the announcement of *Shekalim* on *Rosh Hodesh Adar* even corresponds to the opinion of R. Shimon ben Gamliel, the *Gemara* attempts to determine what section of the Torah is read to announce that the *Shekalim* must be paid (מאי פשרת שקלים). Two possibilities are offered. According to Rav, פשרת שקלים is Number 28:1 ff. (את קרבני לחמי) (לאשה...), while according to Samuel it is Exodus 30:11 ff. (כי תשא את) (כאש בני ישראל). The *Gemara* then continues to show why each of the suggested Torah readings is appropriate.

The *Gemara* then asks, since Numbers 28:1 is read on each and every *Rosh Hodesh*, how is *Rosh Hodesh Adar* to be distinguished from all the others; that is, how would we know from reading Numbers 28:1 ff. that

we are also reminded to bring the half שקל during the month of *Adar*. The answer is that on all other ראשי חודשים, the first six persons called to the Torah read from the regular פרשה (עניני דיומא), and one person reads from Numbers 28:1 ff., whereas on *Rosh Hodesh Adar*, all the עליות would be read from Numbers 28:1 ff.

It is significant to note that the opinion that פשרת שקלים is Numbers 28:1 ff. corresponds to the opinion of R. Tavi, a third generation Palestinian *Amora*. Based on the explanation of the *Gemara*, it can be deduced that in ארץ ישראל, the regular cycle of Torah reading was interrupted on special *Shabbatot* like Shabbat *Shekalim*, since the *Gemara* says explicitly that everyone would read from Numbers 28:1 ff. on *Rosh Hodesh Adar* (ואילו האידנא כולהו בדראש חודש). This conclusion is also stated explicitly in Mishnah *Megillah* 4:4 (בחמישית חזרין לכסדרין). On the fifth week we return to the regular order of *sedarim*.

The *Gemara* now tries to justify the opinion that פשרת שקלים is Numbers 28:1 ff with the Babylonian custom where the regular order of פרשיות is not interrupted on special *Shabbatot*. In such a situation, how would *Rosh Hodesh Adar* be distinguished from all other ראשי חודשים? The answer is that on all other ראשי חודשים six people would read from the regular פרשה and one person would read from Numbers 28:1 ff., whereas on *Rosh Hodesh Adar* only 3 people would read from the regular פרשה and four people would read from Numbers 28:1ff.

An objection is raised to the possibility that Numbers 28:1 ff. was the distinctive Torah reading for פשרת שקלים. The objection is based on *Tosefta Megillah* 3:1, which sets the prophetic reading for פשרת שקלים as II Kings 12:1-17 (the incident of how Yehoyada the High Priest raised the money for repairs for the Temple). This הפטרה has an oblique reference to the collection of the half-שקל (II Kings 12:5 איש כסף נפשו ערכו, the money a man may pay as the money equivalent of persons). Although the reference is really to ערכים (human relations cf. Leviticus 27:21-28), since the text continues to refer to בדק הבית (repairs to breaches in the Temple), the passage was interpreted to refer to the half-שקל which was used for such repairs. Since II Kings 12:1-17 is the הפטרה for פשרת שקלים and the above mentioned phrase is taken as referring to the collection of the half-שקל, this הפטרה seems to correspond to the opinion that פשרת שקלים itself is Exodus 30:11 (כי תשא). The *Gemara* then asks how this הפטרה is appropriate if פשרת שקלים is Numbers 28:1 ff. The *Gemara* responds that the הפטרה still corresponds to the opinion of R. Tavi who says that the phrase חודש חדש בחדשו לחדשי השנה (Numbers 28:14) refers to the donative of the half-שקל.

A second objection is raised to the possibility that Numbers 28:1 ff was the distinctive Torah reading for פשרת שקלים. This objection is based on *Tosefta Megillah* 3:4. What if *Rosh Hodesh Adar* falls during the weekly

Torah portion next to פֶּשֶׁרֶת שְׁקִלִים, either before it or after it? R. Hananel explains the objection by asking how it is possible for פֶּרֶשֶׁת פְּנַחַס (Numbers 28:1 ff.) to occur on *Rosh Hodesh* Dr. Lieberman (*Tosefta Kifshuta Moed*, p. 1165) explains that the objection raised from this *beraita* refers to the opinion of Rav who explained that פֶּשֶׁרֶת שְׁקִלִים is Numbers 28:1 ff. If this is so, how is it possible that *Rosh Hodesh Adar* could occur during the week preceding or following Shabbat *Shekalim*? From this objection the *Gemara* deduces that פֶּשֶׁרֶת שְׁקִלִים must be Ex. 30:11 ff. and *Rosh Hodesh Adar* can periodically occur during the week preceding or following פֶּשֶׁרֶת שְׁקִלִים and in this manner we read from פֶּרֶשֶׁת כִּי תִשָּׂא (Ex. 30:11) twice in two consecutive weeks. Lieberman explains that the objections to this *beraita* was resolved by explaining that the *beraita* refers to the custom of אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל in which the Torah reading cycle was completed in three years שְׁנֵי לְבָנֵי מַעֲרַבָּא דְּמַסְקֵי לְדַאֲוֵרֵייתָא בְּתַלְתָּא. According to this custom, it is possible that *Rosh Hodesh Adar* could fall on the Sabbath next to the regular reading of פֶּרֶשֶׁת פְּנַחַס (Numbers 28:1 ff) and hence פֶּרֶשֶׁת פְּנַחַס could in fact be read on two consecutive weeks.

5. *Hilkhot Tefillah* 13:1.

6. It is less likely that פשוט means “simple” since there is no reason for assuming that the triennial cycle was any more difficult to follow than the annual cycle. If it was in fact more complicated, it was only that the cycle allowed for more freedom and variation than the annual cycle, with different congregations reading different *sedarim* all on the same week. See *infra*. pp. 5-6.

7. Significantly, none of the standard commentaries on *Mishneh Torah* offer an explanation of this passage, indicating first, that their concerns were different from merely explicating and perhaps as well, that they could add little or nothing to what said.

8. Manual Kamroff, ed., *Contemporaries of Marco Polo* (New York, 1928), pp. 313-314. Translation prepared from the text edited by Thomas Wright and published in *Early Travels in Palestine*, Bohn Library, 1848.

9. Ezra Fleischer, “יוונים במנהגי הקריאה של בני ארץ ישראל בתורה,” *ובכביאים* New Series Vol. I (1980-1981), p.25 cf. footnote 2 and literature cited there.

10. The חילוקים have been published in numerous editions, the earliest being that prepared by the Meharshal in his *Yam shel Shlomo* at the end of tractate *Bava Kama* (Prague, 1616). The most comprehensive critical edition was published in 1938 by Mordecai Margulies. As his base text he used the manuscript from Jews College, London (Codex Montefiore No. 49, p. 81) which had earlier been used by Dr. Joel Mueller, who had published the חילוקים under the title *צדקה לדרך* in 1878. Margulies reproduces the text with a critical apparatus based on four previously

printed editions and four hitherto unpublished manuscripts. There is a lengthy introduction wherein Margulies attempts to determine the author, date and place of origin of the text, as well as discuss its later use by the *Geonim*, *Poskim* and Karaites. The text is followed by notes that attempt to explain the חילוקים.

Four years after the appearance of the critical edition by Margulies, B.M. Levin published the חילוקים under the title: אוצר חילוף מנהגים (Jerusalem, 1942). Levin used as his base text a conflated text based on a Vatican manuscript (*Vat Ebraico 320*), a Paris manuscript (*Bibliothèque Nationale Heb. 390*) and a number of other traditions. In small letters he brings the manuscript used by Margulies which he (Levin) ascribes to a Karaite source.

The most startling difference between the two editions is the virtual comprehensiveness of the Margulies base text which includes fifty-one of the fifty-five recorded differences and the fact that Margulies chooses a text that he believes stems from ארץ ישראל (and is hence closest to the original), whereas Levin constructs his text based on sources that appear to make the text originate in Babylonia. I have chosen the Margulies edition as the more authentic, even though the majority of manuscripts are closer in form to the Levin text, in large part because the majority of texts appear to be rewritten under the influence of the prevailing Babylonian school.

11. Mordecai Margulies, ed., *HaHillukim*, p.88 lines 123-126. Of the nine editions and manuscripts Margulies compared with his base-manuscript, only two, the text printed by Mueller as צדקה לדרך and *Yam Shel Shelomo* of the Meharshal, had *Hilluk* 47, while *Hilluk* 48 was included in these two texts as well as in a manuscript found in Jews College, London (catalogue #211) which appears to be a late reworking of the manuscript underlying the text of the צדקה לדרך.

Levin, in his אוצר חילוף מנהגים, p. 96, bases his text for *Hilluk* 47 on *Yam Shel Shelomo*

בני ארץ ישראל קורא העם הפרשה הש"ץ סדרים; בני בבל קורא הש"ץ הפרשה והעם יעמדו וישמעו מלה במלה.

The inhabitants of *Eretz Yisrael*, the people read the *Parashah*, and the *shaliaḥ tzibbur* reads the *sedarim*. The inhabitants of Babylonia, the *shaliaḥ tzibbur* reads the *Parashah* and the people stand and listen word for word.

Similarly, Levin's text for *Hilluk* 48 is based on *Yam Shel Shelomo*

בני בבל עושין שמחת תורה בכל שנה ושנה בחג סוכות וכל מדינה וכל עיר ועיר קורין בפ' אחת; בני א"י אין עושין שמחת תורה אלא לשלש שנים ומחצה וביום שישלימו הפרשה שקורין בפלך זה אין קורין בזה.

The inhabitants of Babylonia observe *Simḥat Torah* annually on Sukkot, and every country and city read the same. The inhabitants of *Eretz Yisrael* celebrate *Simḥat Torah* only every three and a half years on the day they finish (reading the Torah). The *Parashah* read in this province is not (necessarily) read elsewhere.

12. Margulies, *Hillukim*, p. 88. If Margulies is correct, herein lies some evidence both for a later date of the חילוקים when Palestinian Jews found it difficult to resist Babylonian influences and perhaps, with Levin and others for a Babylonian origin for the text.

13. *Esther Rabbah*, *Petihta* 3. The *Ein Hinukh* comments on the exegesis and explains that the *Gematria* of קנה written חסר כתיב is 155, equal to the number of *sedarim*. The fact that the number of *sedarim* is fixed at 154 poses no problem since, as the Beit Yosef points out (*Orah Hayyim* 582 sub voce ארתיות ט"ה ויש בהם ט"ה ארתיות), we are not precise in the use of *Gematria* if the number differs by one.

14. 16:8.

15. Margulies, *Hillukim*, p. 169 notes that according to the former number (154), the Torah reading cycle was finished in three years, while according to the later number (175), it was completed in three and a half years. Cf. the discussion of Michael Higger in his introduction to *Massekhet Soferim*, pages 25-27. Higger notes on pages 291-292 that the original exegesis of R. Yehoshua ben Levi (*Soferim* 16:8 and parallels) refers to the number of פרשיות in the Torah that refer to direct speech to Moses (*dibbur* or *amira* or *tzivui*). The connection of the number 175 from R. Yehoshua's exegeses to the number of *sedarim* in the triennial cycle is an addition of the editor of *Massekhet Soferim*.

16. Adolph Buchler, "The Reading of the Law & Prophets in a Triennial Cycle." *JQR* o.s. Vol. 5 (1893), 420-468; Vol. 6(1894), 1-73.

17. Buchler, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5 (1893), 432 ff. This thesis has been rejected among others by Mann, *The Bible as Read* p.6; Elbogen, *Der Jüdische Gottesdienst* (Hebrew edition D'vir Publishers 1972), p. 426, footnote 48, Heinemann "HaMaḥzor Hatlat Sh'nati," *Tarbitz* 33 (1964), p.363.

18. Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read*, p.6.

19. Mann, *op. cit.*, p.7; cf. Ben Zion Wacholder's *Prolegomenon* to the reissue of Mann's *The Bible as Read*, pp. XII-XIII.

20. Wacholder, *op. cit.*, p. XIII.

21. The *Kerobot* were first edited by Menahen Zulay *Piyyute Yannai* (Berlin, 1938). They are now being reissued and re-edited by Z. M. Rabinowitz *Maḥzor Piyyute Rabbi Yannai* (Tel Aviv, 1981). So far, Volume I has appeared, which includes an Introduction and the *Kerobot* for Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus.

22. Mann. *op. cit.*, p. 7.

23. Issachar Joel. "A *Keter* from the Year 5020 A.M. (1290)," *Kiryat Sepher* 38 (1963), p. 122 (in Hebrew).

24. Joel, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125. The *sedarim*, together with other typical masoretic information, is listed in 4 columns that precede the text of the Torah and 3 and 1/2 columns that follow. In these lists the number of *sedarim* is given as 154. Furthermore, within the text of the Torah, the *sedarim* are marked in a style that is far more pronounced than the way the פְּרָשִׁיּוֹת of the annual cycle are marked. This latter marking of the *sedarim* both reduces the number to 141 and occasionally even changes the beginning of a *seder*. The number of *sedarim* in the lists and in the body of the Text can be compared as follows:

	List	Body
Genesis	43	39
Exodus	29	28
Leviticus	23	20
Numbers	32	28
Deuteronomy	<u>27</u>	<u>26</u>
Total	154	141

Joel (*op. cit.* pp. 126-127) compares this new arrangement of *sedarim* with the previously designated list found in the third edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (Leipzig, 1929) and in C.D. Ginsburg's Masoretic-critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible (London, 1894) both of which designate 167 *sedarim* and also with the list of 154 *sedarim* first published by Jacob ben Ḥayyim in the so called Bomberg Bible (Venice 1524).

The Kittel text is based on the Leningrad ms. and is the oldest known source which designates 167 *sedarim*. Ginsburg's list of *sedarim* is based primarily on the list included in the so-called Tigéain Notebook, first published by Joseph Derenbourg as *Manuel du lecteur* (Paris, 1871), pp. 111-125. This latter list is almost identical to the list in the Leningrad ms., showing in fact only two small differences:

Leningrad ms. begins a new *seder* at וַיְהִי אַבְרָהָם בֶּן תְּשַׁעִים שָׁנָה Gen. 17:1

Whereas the list in the *Manuel* starts a new *seder* at: וַיִּגַּד אַבְרָהָם לְאֵמֶר הוּא הִנֵּה יֵלֵדָה מִלְכָּה גַם הוּא Gen. 22:20

With regard to the arrangement of 154 *sedarim*, the source for Jacob ben Ḥayyim is unknown. Besides its late appearance in the Bomberg Bible and in the list at the end of the *Keter* from 1290 published by Joel, this list occurs in a number of other manuscripts.

(1) an Ashenazic ms. from 1294 now in the New York Public Library and catalogued in *The People and the Book* New York, 1954 No. 3.

(2) a 13th century Ashkenazic ms. described by Schwartz in a catalogue of mss. in *Austra* No.1.

(3) a 14th century Sephardic ms. in the National Library in Vienna catalogued by Schwartz as No.2.

(4) an Italo-Shephardic ms. from 1448 catalogued by Margoliot as No. 2. Sadly the so-called Aleppo codex, the oldest known masoretic ms. begins with Deuteronomy 26:1 and lacks a masoretic list of *Sedarim* at the end of the extant part of the Torah.

25. Joel, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

26. B. *Megillah* 30b.

27. R. Ami's interpretation, which is rejected by the Bavli, is hard to square even with the Palestinian model. We have no reason to believe that the Palestinian custom did not require seven individuals to read from the Torah on Shabbat, each reading a minimum of three verses. If the regular *seder* of Torah readings were interrupted on *Shabbat Zakhor*, it would appear that all seven individuals would read the same three verses from Deuteronomy 25:17-19. While this is possible, it is also quite unlikely. We must therefore conclude against Joel that even in ארץ ישראל the accepted practice was that of R. Jeremiah *leseder hahaftarot hozrin*.

28. As we shall see, Joel's entire thesis is further weakened by his supposition that the division into 145 *sedarim* reflects a triennial cycle in which two of the three years are intercalated, a situation which Joel himself notes occurs only twice in 57 years. Such an unusual occurrence is hardly likely to give rise to the "standard" number of *sedarim*. For an alternate explanation, see the explanations of Heinemann and Fleischer to be discussed below.

29. Here again Joel's thesis is flawed since in one three and a half year cycle, *Adar* will occur four times and in the other only three times. Does 167 *sedarim* correspond to the former, in which case four *sedarim* must be combined in the latter, or does this division correspond to the latter situation, in which case 171 *sedarim* would be necessary when *Adar* occurs four times in the cycle?

30. Cf. Joel, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-132.

31. Wacholder, *Prolegomenon*, Appendix I, pp. LI to LXVII.

32. Wacholder, *op. cit.*, p. XXVII; cf. Heinemann, "The Triennial Cycle and the Annual Cycle," *Tarbitz* 33, (1964) p. 365 (in Hebrew).

33. Ezra Fleischer, "*Simhat Torah Shel Benei ישראל*," *Sinai* 59 (1966), pp. 226-227.

34. The Mishnah continues with the clause, אבל מוסיפין, אין פוחתין מהן, עליהן ומפטירין בנביא. As the *Tosafot Yom Tov* indicates, this clause has an ambiguous referend. He explains אבל מוסיפין עליהן as referring to all the items in the Mishnah's list of the number of people who read from the Torah (אכולהו קאי), but then adds that others explain the Mishnah that only the words אין פוחתין מהן refers to the entire list, but the phrase אבל מוסיפין refers only to Shabbat. In the notes of R. Akiba Eiger, he ascribes

this last opinion and its explanation to the Ran, who says we may make הוספות on Shabbat because there is no day that is more special than Shabbat.

35. According to this *Tosefta*, the phrase אבל מוסיפין עליהן in Mishnah *Megillah* 4:2 refers to the entire list. B. *Megillah* 23a presents the *beraita* differently and leads the Gemara to question who the author of M. *Megillah* 4:2 was.

מתניתין מני? לא ר' ישמעאל ולא ר' עקיבא דתניא ביו"ט חמשה ויוה"כ ששה ובשבת שבעה אין פוחתין מהן ואין מוסיפין עליהן דברי ר' ישמעאל ר"ע אומר ביו"ט חמשה ביוה"כ שבעה ובשבת ששה אין פוחתין מהן אבל מוסיפין עליהן.

Who was the author of the Mishnah? Neither R. Yishmael nor R. Akiba. As we learned on Yom Tov five, on Yom Kippur six, on Shabbat seven, we do not lessen or increase the number – this is the opinion of R. Yishmael. R. Akiba says on Yom Tov five, on Yom Kippur seven, and on Shabbat six. We do not lessen (the number), but we do increase (the number).

The Gemara resolves the problem by quoting *Tosefta* and concluding that there were two authentic, but conflicting opinions ascribed to R. Ishmael. Parenthetically, the Gemara manages to make the Mishnah fit the opinion of R. Akiva, as well as that of R. Ishmael.

36. *Tosefta Megillah* 4:17 אין קורין בתורה פחות משלשה פסוקים בכרך אחד One who reads the Torah does not read fewer than three verses in one bundle. cf. B. *Megillah* 25a, B. *Ta'anit* 27b *Tanḥuma Ki Tissa* Para. 28, Deuteronomy Rabbah 7:8 (p. 111), and *Soferim* 11:1.

The debate in B. *Ta'anit* 27b is interesting and instructive. Mishnah *Ta'anit* 4:3 refers to the appropriate Torah readings on each of four fast days observed by the priestly *ma'amadot* or posts. The reading on the first day was Genesis 1:1-18, which in the Torah is broken up into two paragraphs of five and three verses respectively. If the first paragraph is assigned to two readers, it is impossible for each of them to read three verses as required by Mishnah. The Gemara continues:

בשלמא יהי רקיע באחד, תלתא פסוקי הוו אלא בראשית בשנים? ה' פסוקי הויין ותנן "הקורא בתורה אל יפחות מד' פסוקים" רב אמר דולג ושמואל אמר פוסק.

One reader can read, "Let there be an expanse..." for this section has three verses, but "In the beginning..." has only two, (altogether) there are five. And we learned, 'One who reads in the Torah should not read less than three verses.' Rav explained, the reader *doleg*, and Shmuel says *posek*.

Here *doleg* does not mean to skip, but as Rashi explains, it means to repeat. The first reader reads three verses and the second reader repeats the last verse of the former reader and then completes the reading by adding two more. On the other hand, *posek* means to divide and as Rashi explains, each reader reads two and a half verses, possibly indicating the still fluid nature of the verse divisions in the third century. Such an approach to verse division may help to explain how exceptionally short Palestinian *sedarim* with as few as fourteen verses (e.g., Gen. 8:1-14) could constitute the entire Torah reading for a Shabbat morning, when a minimum of 21 verses had to be read to meet the double demand of Mishnah that no fewer than seven people read the Torah and that each read no fewer than three verses.

37. Cf. Yerushalmi *Megillah* 4:5 (75b); B. *Megillah* 25a. Lieberman (*Tosefta Kifshuta, Seder Moed* p. 1190) explains the ruling according to the *Bavli* as a restrictive ruling (*gezerah*) imposed on account of those who leave the synagogue in the interim and who might think that if the first person does not complete the paragraph, the subsequent reader would only read two verses.

38. Cf. Yerushalmi *Megillah* 4:5 (75b); B. *Megillah* 25a, B. *Ta'anit* 27b. Lieberman (*op. cit.* p. 1190) explains the ruling according to the *Bavli* as a restrictive ruling (*gezerah*) imposed on account of those who enter the synagogue late and who, seeing the second person read fewer than three verses from the succeeding paragraph, might conclude that the reader began from the beginning of the succeeding paragraph and hence read less than the three required verses. This ruling is given in the *Bavli* in the name of *yesh omrim*. A second *beraita*, however, opines that the second reader only reads one verse from the subsequent paragraph and that we pay no attention to late-comers, that is the one who comes in late and wonders how the reader could read fewer than three verses would ask those already present and they would explain the circumstances.

39. Leviticus 23:26-32 cf. M. *Yoma* 7:1.

40. Cf parallels Yerushalmi *Yoma* 7:1 (44b) Yerushalmi *Sotah* 7:6 (22a). *Soferim* 11:3 records the explanation differently from the Yerushalmi:

מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה. לפי שגוללין נביא ברבים ואין גוללין ספר תורה ברבים. וכן אמר ר' ירמיה אין גוללין ספר תורה ברבים. ר' יוסי פתר לה, בשם ר' שמעון במ לקיש כגון שהיתה פרשה קטנה, כדי שישמעו ישראל את התורה על הסדר.

We skip in the *Navi* (prophets) but not in the Torah, because we can roll the *Navi* (scroll) publicly, but we do not roll the Torah (scroll) publicly. And this is what R. Yirmiyah said, 'We do not roll the

Torah (scroll) publicly.’ R. Yosi explained in the name of R. Shimon ben Lakish, this refers to a short *Parashah*, so that all Israel will hear the Torah (read) in order.

cf. *Responsa Terumat HaDeshen* #20; *Sefer HaRavya* Part 2 para. 586.

41. Lieberman (*op. cit.* p. 1192) points out that the *Hasdei David* on *Tosefta Megillah* notes that this halakhah is not brought in either the Bavli or *Yerushalmi* and Lieberman himself notes that it is not brought by any of the *posekim*, either. However, with the recent publication of *Sefer HaItim* (para. 185, p. 275 ff.), this ruling is quoted. The implication of the ruling, as deduced by Maharam Mintz in his *Responsa* (#85) is that we do not read continuously from one book of the Torah to another on a single Shabbat. (*Simhat Torah* according to the annual cycle is exceptional.) The corollary is that if only six people read from the concluding section of a given book, we do not add an additional *aliyah* from the succeeding book, but rather seven people must read from the succeeding book as if we begin the Torah reading *de nove*.

42. Cf. *Sefer Ittim*, para. 185. p. 275ff.; Tashbez Part II, para. 70, end of p. 17a ff. This law is deduced *a fortiori* from the first ruling. This second ruling follows the custom of בני ארץ ישראל who did not complete the Torah on *Simhat Torah* but on a regular Shabbat. Lieberman (*op. cit.* p. 1193, footnote 82) discusses a difference of opinion between R. Saadya Gaon and R. Hai Gaon. He concludes that both are of the opinion that one does not read from two books of the Torah on a single Shabbat (the implication of our *Tosefta*), but that R. Saadya follows the *Tosefta* consistently and holds that if only six read from the concluding section of one book, seven must be called to read from the succeeding book (df. *Siddur Rav Saadya*, p. 362) – whereas R. Hai permits the seventh person to reread what has already been read and does not require seven additional readers to read in the succeeding book.

43. M. *Megillah* 3:6.

44. B. *Megillah* 31b.

45. Lieberman (*Tosefta Kifshuta*, p. 1174) raises a question of the *Rishonim* regarding our *sugya*. If the literal understanding of the Mishnah is according to the explanation of R. Yehuda in *Tosefta*, why did the *Bavli* simply not say *halakhah kematnitin*. The *Rishonim* (cf. Rashba, Ritba, Ran, *ad. loc.*) explained that the Mishnah is ambiguous regarding what is read on Shabbat *minḥah*, Monday and Thursday, and only indicates that what is read on these three occasions is repeated on the following Shabbat. It is thus possible to explain that what we read on Monday continues from where we stopped reading on a Shabbat *minḥah* and that what we read on Thursday continues from where we stopped reading on Monday, but that on the following Shabbat we repeat what

had been read in the interim. This, as I indicated in the text, is a possible explanation of R. Yehudah in the *Tosefta* (i.e., he does not contradict the view of R. Meir in the *reisha*, but only in the *seifa*). Thus, the *beraita* is reformulated in the *Bavli* to adjust R. Yehudah's view with what was apparently Babylonian practice.

ר' יהודה אומר מקום שמפסיקין בשבת שחרית שם קורין במנחה ובשני
ובחמישי ולשבת הבאה.

R. Yehudah says at the place we end at Shabbat morning, there we read at (Shabbat) *Minḥah*, Monday and Thursday mornings, and (begin) the following Shabbat morning.

46. Most recently this has been the philosophic underpinning of our decision regarding the use of Gentile wine where the nonnormative precedent of the *Noda Beyehuda* was extended far beyond its original intention (cf. the paper of Rabbi Elliot Dorff, "Are All Wines Kosher?"). For a full discussion of this principle, see Seymour Siegel, *Conservative Judaism and Jewish Law*, pp. xiii-xxvi, especially p.xxii.

47. Mann, *The Bible as Read*; cf. B. *Megillah* 23 b, but in Y. *Megillah* 75a the number of verses was reduced to three.

48. Margulies, *Haḥillukim*, p. 169. We should recall that the custom in Babylonia was to limit sermons to *Shabbat Shuvah* and *Shabbat Haggadol*, both of which fell in the *yarḥe dekala*.

49. The converse is not necessarily true, i.e., by abbreviating the service we will attract more people to the synagogue. But those who do attend should not be fatigued by a service that values completeness and haste above inherent beauty and real Torah study. cf. Gilbert Rosenthal, "Prayer and the Conservative Jew," *Conservative Judaism* 37 (1984), 24-27.

50. Zvi Chajes, *Hiddusehi Harav Zvi Chajes al Massekhet Megillah*, to B. *Megillah* 31b

לפי זה לא ידעתי לבני מערבא דמסקי אורייתא בתלת שנין . . . איך היו עושים
בתקנת עזרא זאת שתבוא קריאת הקללות קודם עצרת בכל שנה.

51. Mann, *The Bible as Read*, p.5.

52. Wacholder, *Prolegomenon* p. XXIII.

53. See infra pages 15-17 for a complete discussion of our knowledge of the Palestinian *haftarot*.

54. Theodor was the first to recognize the relationship between the midrashic selections and the triennial cycle (cf. "Die Midrashim zum Pentateuch und der dreijährige pal. Cyclus," M.G.W.J., vol. 34-36, 1885-1887). Mann (*The Bible as Read*, pp. 11-15) and Wacholder (*Prolegomenon*, pp. XXXIV-XXXVIII and the bibliography cited in footnotes 53-60) develop the connection still further.

Mann proposed the theory, which has proven to be erroneous, that verses used to introduce the *petiḥtot*, especially of Genesis and Leviticus Rabbah, were chosen because they “*tallied linguistically with a verse found within the compass of the הפטרה*. Often the whole trend of the *aggadah* developed in the *Petiḥta* can be accounted for only by turning to the הפטרה which gave the homilist his starting point . . . Thus, the הפטרה formed the bridge that joined the Torah *Seder* with the *Petiḥta* verse which as a rule was chosen from the Hagiographa. . . . In this manner, the preacher demonstrated to his audience the *union of the three divisions of the Bible*.” (Mann, *The Bible as Read*, p. 12). Mann exemplified this thesis by further arguing that the choice of a particular halakhah to introduce a *Yelamdenu Rabbenu* style *midrash* was also predicated by a suggestion given the homilist by a given verse in the הפטרה. In this manner, the homilist also demonstrated “*the union of the Written Law with the Oral . . .*” Mann’s error lay in assuming that the midrashic selections were based on different *haftarot* from the ones found in the Genizah lists and alluded to in Yannai’s *Piyyutim*, *haftarot* which he concluded were late.

55. The first to recognize the relation between the *Qerobot* written by Yannai was Menahem Zulay, who published an edition of his *Piyyutim* in 1938. These *Piyyutim* have recently been reissued in a critical edition with extensive scholarly notes and cross references by Z.M. Rabinowitz. Wacholder (*Prolegomenon*, p. XL) points out that Yannai wrote at least one *Qeroba* for each of the 154 *sedarim*, as well as others for festivals and special occasions. These *qerobot* were either *kedushtot* or *shebatot*, the former being written to introduce the *Kedushah*, the later being used to embellish all seven blessings of the *Amidah*. The *kedushta* is a highly stylized poem of 9 stanzas whose content was gleaned from the *halakhah* and *aggadah* of the weekly *seder*. The first stanza of the *kedushta* concludes with the opening verse of the weekly *seder*. The second stanza cites the second verse and the third stanza concludes with the first verse of the triennial הפטרה.

56. I have used the so-called Bomberg edition of the rabbinic Bible as the standard for the division of *sedarim*. In all but two instances it corresponds to the *Keter* of the biblical manuscript from Damascus, dated 1290, which was collated by Issakhar Joel. Joel considers the list at the end of each book to be original (*Keter*, p. 125), while the reduced number of *sedarim* included in the body of each book was secondary and added by a later hand. Moreover, Joel argues that the standard number of *sedarim* was recognized even in the east as 154, as evidenced by the Yemenite codices called *Maḥberet Tigeian*. While these codices divide the Torah internally into 167 *sedarim* and hence formed the basis of Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica* and C.D. Ginsberg’s Massoretic Bible, nonetheless the *Maḥberet Tigeian* ends with the sentence:

ומנין סדרים של התורה מאה וחמישים וארבעה נדג המנין שם קליטה.

The number of *sedarim* of the Torah are 154, corresponding to the numerical value of the word *klitah* (154).

57. The advantages of the first solution are threefold. First, it allows us to follow a triennial cycle of 154 *sedarim* without exception. Second, we are familiar with the procedure of repeating verses in order to make up the requisite number of verses.

(1) On *Rosh Hodesh*, Numbers 28:3 is repeated as the first verse of the second *aliyah*.

(2) On *Simhat Torah*, the first five עליות of *Vezot Haberakhah* are repeated again and again until each member of the congregation has received an *aliyah*.

Finally, according to our understanding of M. *Megillah* 3:4 where the Palestinian cycle of Torah readings was interrupted for the four special readings of *Adar*, Deuteronomy 25:17-19 constituted the entire Torah reading for *Shabbat Zakhor*. This could only have been possible if the three verses were repeated seven times.

The obvious disadvantage of this solution is its repetitious character. Only one of the exceptionally short *sedarim* has content that we might subjectively consider worthy of repetition (Genesis 12:1-9, the command to Abram to set out for Canaan) and at least one of the *sedarim* (Numbers 25:1-9, the Israelite apostasy with the Midianite women at *Baal Peor*), has content which our members, again subjectively, might consider offensive (although a little added emphasis on promiscuity and adultery might not be all that bad in our age).

Combination of short *sedarim* with either the preceding or succeeding *seder* has the obvious advantage of avoiding monotonous repetition, but the questionable disadvantage of reducing the number of *sedarim* from 154 to 143. Since we are aware from the biblical manuscript described by Joel the Torah lections were divided into as few as 141 *sedarim*, usually by the combination of short *sedarim*, such a combination of *sedarim* is indeed possible. Joel points out that while the manuscript divides the Torah internally into only 141 *sedarim*, at the end of each book it lists the standard number of *sedarim*, which add up to 154. Thus, the internal division reflected a practical guide to local usage in one specific community, even while it acknowledged the “universal” standard of 154 *sedarim*. The possibility of returning to the universal standard of 154 *sedarim* by subdividing some of the longer *sedarim*, as was done in the Leningrad manuscript, published by Kittel as *Biblia Hebraica*, has the dubious advantage of retaining an arbitrary number of *sedarim* that are in fact a conflation of *sedarim* in three otherwise autonomous systems.

The third solution, that of continuing the reading of a short *sefer* into the reading of the succeeding week and then returning to the beginning of the *sefer* on the succeeding week, has the double advantage of not repeating verses on any one specific week and of keeping the standard 154 *sedarim*. Indeed, some scholars have argued that since the list of *sedarim* only give the initial verse of each *sefer*, there is no reason to conclude that one *sefer* ended exactly where the next one began. This thesis, however, directly contradicts *Tosefta Megillah* 3:10, where according to Rabbi Yehudah, the place where we stop reading on one Shabbat is precisely where we begin on the subsequent Shabbat, not to mention *Shabbat Minḥah*, Monday and Thursday.

It should be clear then that in order to meet the halakhic criteria of the Mishnah and *Tosefta*, only the first two solutions to the problem of short *sedarim*, either used in isolation or in tandem, are legitimate options.

58. Cf. in the period before standardization, *Leviticus Rabbah* 3:6, where R. Hanina bar Abba visited a given city and found that to his surprise a *sefer* began with Leviticus 2:10 – והנותרת מן המנחה לאהרון ולבניו – and in the period after standardization, cf. the *Hillukim bein Anshei Mizrah veAnshe Ma'arav*, number 48 in the critical apparatus.

59. Three of the *sedarim* actually begin in the middle of a masoretic paragraph, indicated in the table by the letter X (*Sedarim* 20, 24 and 92), one ends in the middle of a masoretic paragraph (*Seder* 23) and two begin and end in the middle of a masoretic paragraph (*Sedarim* 26 and 27).

60. *Hilkhot Tefillah* 13:5.

61. *Orah Hayyim* 138:1.

62. Positive verses would indicate God's blessing (Genesis 2:3), a positive act by a biblical character (Genesis 4:26, עז הוחל לקרא בשם השם), a positive attribute of a biblical character (Genesis 6:8, ונח מצא חן בעיני, השם), a positive act by God (Genesis 9:17, ויאמר אלוהים אל נח זאת אות, הברית). Neutral verses indicate factual activities about biblical characters which have no morally positive or negative quality (Genesis 33:17, where Jacob builds a house at Sukkot) or announce the birth of a secondary biblical character (38:30, the birth of Zerah, son of Judah and Tamar). Neutral verses indicate genealogical information (Gen. 9:18 ויהיו בני נח, ויפת (היצאים מן התבה שם וחם ויפת) or the death of minor biblical characters (Genesis 11:32, the death of Terah). Neutral verses indicate factual activities about biblical characters that have a somewhat negative quality (Genesis 20:1, Abram settles in Gerar), or genealogical information about negative biblical characters (Genesis 25:18, the genealogy of Ishmael). Negative verses indicate sad or negative features of major biblical characters (Genesis 26:35, ותהיין מרת רוח ליצחק ולרבקה, referring

to the marriage of Esau; Genesis 12:10, Abram's departure from Canaan to Egypt; Genesis 40:23, יוסף וזכר שר המשקים את יוסף, or punishment for transgression of a law, Exodus 30:38, ומפתח אהל מועד לא תצאו, or warnings of punishment, Leviticus 10:7, ומפתח אהל מועד לא תצאו (פן תמתו).

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 63. | Genesis 3:22
Numbers 5:12
Numbers 13:1
Numbers 16:1
Leviticus 17:1 | the expulsion from the garden
איש איש כי תשטה אשתו ומעלה בו מעל
שלח לך אנשים ויתרו את ארץ כנען
ויקח קרח... ויקמו לפני משה
punishment for sacrifices performed outside
of camp |
| 64. | Genesis 40:23
Genesis 44:17
Leviticus 20:27

Leviticus 22:16 | ולא זכר שר המשקים את יוסף וישכחהו
האיש אשר נמצא הגביע בידו הוא יהיה לי לעבד
ואיש או אשה אשר יהיה בהם אוב או ידעוני מות
יומתו
ואיש כי יאכל קדש בשגגה... והשיאו אותם עון
אשמה |
| 65. | Numbers 20:13
Genesis 12:10
Genesis 16:1
Numbers 11:23
Numbers 14:11
Numbers 25:1 | המה מי מריבה אשר רבו בני ישראל את ה' ויקדש במ
ויהי רעב בארץ וירד אברם מצרימה
ושרי אשתו לא ילדה לו
ויאמר ה' אל משה היד ה' תקצר
ויאמר ה' אל משה עד אנה ינעצני העם הזה
וישב ישראל בשטים ויחל העם לזנות אל בנות מואב |
| 66. | Genesis 26:35
Genesis 31:2
Genesis 42:17
Exodus 16:2-3

Exodus 22:23
Exodus 30:38
Leviticus 10:7
Leviticus 17:16
Numbers 11:22

Numbers 14:10
Numbers 14:45

Numbers 27:14 | ותהיין מרת רוח ליצחק ולרבקה
וירא יעקב אל פני לבן והנה איננו עמו כתמול שלשום
ויאסף אותם אל משמר שלשת ימים
וילונו כל עדת בני ישראל... ויאמרו... מי יתן מותנו
ביד ה'...
וחרה אפי והרגתי אתכם בחרב...
איש אשר יעשה כמוה להריח בה ונכרת מעמיו
ומפתח אהל מועד לא תצאו פן תמותו
ואם לא יכבסו ובשרו לא ירחץ ונשא עונו
ויאמר משה שש מאות אלף רגלי העם... ואתה אמרת
בשר אתן להם
ויאמרו כל העדה לרגום אותם באבנים
וירד העמלקי והכנעני היושב בהר ההוא ויכוסו ויכתו
עד חרמה
כאשר מריתם פי במדבר צין במריבת העדה
להקדישני במים |
| | Deuteronomy 8:20
Deuteronomy 22:5 | כגוים אשר ה' מאביד מפניכם כן תאבדון
לא יהיה כלי גבר על אשה... כח תועבת ה' אלקיך כל
עשה אלה |
| | Deuteronomy 27:26 | ארור כל אשר לא יקים את דברי התורה זאת |

67. B. *Megillah* 31b.
68. page 355.
69. B. *Berakhot* 8a.
70. We offer as an analogy the Mishnah's dictum (M. *Pesahim* 4:1)
ההולך ממקום שעושין (מלאכה בערבי פסחים) למקום שאין עושין, אין ממקום
שאיין עושים למקום שעושין, נותנין עלים וחמרי מקום שיצא משם חמרי מקום
שהלך לשם.
71. Adolph Buchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a
Triennial Cycle," *J.Q.R.* o.s. 5 (1893) 420-468;6 (1894) 1-73.
72. Mann, *The Bible as Read*, pp. 561-574.
73. Oxford Hebrew Ms. Bodleian 2727 f. 21 pp. 24-31.
74. Wacholder, *Prolegomenon*, pp. XXIX – XXX.
75. *Ibid.*, pp. LI – LXVII.
76. Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.
77. cf. Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. 78, 85, 134 *etc.*
78. Thus Bodleian 2727 lists Isaiah 42:7-21 as the הפטרה for Genesis
8:15-9:17 (*Seder* 6), which Mann reduces to Isaiah 42:7-15 & 21, here
with the support of two other Oxford mss. (Bodl. 2822 and 2828); on the
other hand, Bodleian 2727 lists Isaiah 49:9-14 (6 verses) as the הפטרה for
Genesis 9:18 – 11:22, but the two other Oxford mss. (Bodl. 2822 and
2828) give Isaiah 49:9-23 (15 verses). From this data, Mann creates a 10
verse הפטרה, Isaiah 49:9-17 & 23.
79. Mann, *op. cit.*, p.11.
80. Wacholder, *Prolegomenon*, pp. XXXI – XXXIII.
81. *Shaare Teshuvah* #214.
82. Margulies, *Hillukim*, #48 p.88.
83. Quoted in *Contemporaries of Marco Polo*, edited by Manuel
Kamroff, pp. 313-314.
84. Margulies, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
85. Heinemann, "The 'Triennial Cycle' and the Annual Cycle,"
Tarbitz 33 (1964), 363 (in Hebrew).
86. Fleischer, "Simhat Torah of Palestine," *Sinai* 59 (1966), 209-227
(Hebrew).
87. *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.
88. *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.