

MASTER'S PROJECT

# The Sequential Triennial Cycle: A History and Guide to its Modern Use

---

**Submitted by Aaron Marsh**

For the Degree of Master of the Arts

The Academy for Jewish Religion,

Yonkers, NY

Spring 2015

Advisor: Rabbi Michael Pitkowsky

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>A History of the Sequential Triennial Cycle</b> .....	4
Reading the Torah in the Biblical Period.....	4
Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the 1 <sup>st</sup> Century .....	6
Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the Tannaitic Period .....	9
Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the Amoraic Period .....	19
The Sequential Triennial Cycle in the Post-Amoraic Period .....	31
Modern Scholarship on the Sequential Triennial Cycle.....	71
What Remains Unknown .....	112
<b>Reviving the Sequential Triennial Cycle for Modern Synagogue Use</b> .....	114
Introduction .....	114
Previous Efforts to Create a Modern Sequential Triennial Cycle .....	116
Halakhah .....	118
Reconstructing Late Historical Practice .....	124
Aliyah Breaks.....	138
Calendar Considerations for Combining S'darim .....	139
The Baraita of the Curses.....	144
Simḥat Torah.....	146
Obstacles to Switching to this Cycle.....	149
Towards the Future of the Sequential Triennial Cycle.....	153
<b>Table of Figures</b>	
<b>Table 1: S'darim and Haftarot of the Sequential Triennial Cycle in Yannai's Piyyutim</b> .....	32
<b>Table 2: Romaniote and Karaite Haftarot (excluding those tied to calendar)</b> .....	36
<b>Table 3: The Seder Divisions in the G'nizah Fragments</b> .....	43
<b>Table 4: The Haftarot in the G'nizah Fragments</b> .....	48
<b>Table 5: The Seder Divisions in the Masoretic Text</b> .....	60
<b>Table 6: Büchler's Mapping of the Sequential Triennial Cycle to a Fixed Calendar</b> .....	72
<b>Table 7: A Comparison of the Theories of Naeh and Fleischer</b> .....	111
<b>Table 8: S'darim and Haftarot for a Modern Sequential Triennial Cycle Implementation</b> .....	129
<b>Table 9: Permutations of a Single Jewish Calendar Year</b> .....	140
<b>Table 10: Permutations of Three Jewish Calendar Years</b> .....	140
<b>Table 11: S'darim to Combine Based on Based on the Calendar</b> .....	143
<b>Table 12: Torah Divisions for the Last Day of Sh'mini Atzeret When it is Not Simḥat Torah</b> .....	148

## Introduction

---

לבני מערבא דמסקי לדאורייתא בתלת שנין

The people of the West (in Eretz Yisrael) finish the Torah in three years.<sup>1</sup>

Today, the Torah is read nearly everywhere following a system of 54 divisions (*parashiyot*) that are read over the course of a year, but this was not always so. For centuries, a second system was used that split the Torah into a different set of around three times as many divisions which were read over the course of three to three and a half years – the Sequential Triennial Cycle. This is not to be confused with the non-sequential “triennial cycle” implemented in the 1980’s by the Conservative Movement in America. Although this is the “triennial cycle” of which that most American Jews are aware, it is, in fact, a modern invention that has close ties to the Annual Cycle and not to the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Though in widespread use in America, as we shall see, this modern cycle actually is in conflict with a Tannaitic requirement to begin reading each Shabbat at the point in the Torah where the previous week’s reading ended – a requirement which was codified as *halakhah*. Even as a practical matter, skipping several chapters of the Torah from week to week makes following the threads of narrative and law disjointed, and we miss some of the nuances that tie the parts together.

This paper will summarize the known facts, theories, and research regarding the Sequential Triennial Cycle and present a full Torah reading system based on the historical practice that complies with all of the halakhic requirements for Torah reading. This is not a purely theoretical endeavor, and it is hoped that make these materials available will encourage congregations to give new life to this historical reading system. To that end, a *humash* supplement has been produced that can be used in synagogue in conjunction with a standard Annual Cycle *humash* to employ this system. Many congregations have desired to have a shorter weekly Torah reading than the Annual Cycle allows and/or have had difficulty finding readers to prepare the long An-

---

<sup>1</sup> Talmud Bavli. Megillah 29b.

nual Cycle portions. While several halakhically questionable ways to accomplish this have been employed, this system provides a halakhic, historically-based solution that also works aesthetically better than its alternatives.

Before embarking on a trip through the history of the cycle, a few comments regarding the terminology used in this work:

- ***THE Sequential Triennial Cycle***: Although throughout this work, the reading system is referred to in this way, it would be more correct to say there were a group of practices with local variations and modifications over time. Indeed saying “*a sequential triennial cycle*” might indeed be more accurate in many cases, but as a matter of convenience, all the practices have been grouped together under this single title. It is also worth noting that, as we shall see, the duration probably was not actually exactly three years, at least in most places and times it was used.
- ***Parashah***: A division of the Torah for weekly reading. This can be used in the sources to mean *either* a division of the Annual Cycle or the Sequential Triennial Cycle, but as time went on, it became specifically associated with the Annual Cycle divisions and not the Sequential Triennial Cycle ones. Thus, except when citing sources, the term *parashah* in this work means a division of the Annual Cycle only. It should also be noted that the word *parashah* also means a Masoretic paragraph in the Biblical text (a group of lines with empty space preceding and following it). This has been consistently translated to English as “paragraph” to avoid confusion, but there is at least one source that we shall look at where the use of the term is ambiguous.
- ***Seder***: This term is also used to designate a division for a weekly reading in one of the systems. In this case, over time it became the standard term specifically for a division of the Sequential Triennial Cycle, and thus, except for when citing sources, the term *seder* in this work always refers to that system only.
- ***Haftarah***: This well-known term has been used for the reading from the books of the Prophets that follows the Shabbat morning Torah reading. It was also historically

known as an *ashlamata*, an Aramaic term having much the same meaning: “concluding reading.” In fact, it seems like this latter term was more commonly used in places that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was practiced. Nevertheless, the familiar term to modern readers has been used consistently.

- **Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle:** This term has been used to refer to the system for reading Torah that has its roots in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, but was not formally delineated until the 1980’s. Others have called it the “Modified Triennial Cycle,” but either term probably implies too much of a relationship with the historical cycle than this system actually has. Nevertheless, it is what is commonly referred to as “the triennial cycle” in recent decades.

---

## A History of the Sequential Triennial Cycle

---

### *Reading the Torah in the Biblical Period*

In order to establish a context for the emergence of the Sequential Triennial Cycle, it is necessary to look first at the development of the ritual of public Torah reading. The earliest source for such a reading can be found in the Torah itself, a practice which became known as *hakhel*:

וַיִּצַו מֹשֶׁה אוֹתָם לֵאמֹר מִקֵּץ שִׁבְעַ שָׁנִים בְּמֵעַד שְׁנַת הַשְּׁמִטָּה בְּחַג הַסֻּכּוֹת: בָּבוֹא  
כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל לְרֵאוֹת אֶת-פָּנָי יי אֵל הָיָד בְּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר תִּקְרָא אֶת-הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת  
נֶגֶד כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם:

And Moses commanded them saying, “At the end of seven years, during the set time of the *sh'mittah* year, during the Festival of Sukkot, when all Israel comes to appear before ADONAI Your God in the place which he will choose, you shall read this teaching in front of all of Israel, in their hearing.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Deut. 31:10-11.

Here we see that a public reading from the Torah was intended to be performed every seven years in Jerusalem. It is unclear from the text what specifically is to be read and the process for doing so.<sup>3</sup> This does not by any means describe a regular Torah reading cycle.

The book of Joshua relates an isolated case of a public reading:

וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן, קָרָא אֶת־כָּל־דְּבָרֵי הַתּוֹרָה, הַבְּרָכָה, וְהַקְּלָלָה – כְּכֹל־הַפְּתוּב, בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה. לֹא־הָיָה דְבָר מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה, אֲשֶׁר לֹא־קָרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, נֶגֶד כָּל־קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַנָּשִׁים וְהַטּוֹף, וְהַגֵּר הַהֹלֵךְ בְּקִרְבָּם.

And afterwards, he read all the words of the Teaching: the blessing and the curse, according to all that was written in the Book of the Teaching. There was not a word from all that Moses commanded that Joshua did not read in front of the entire congregation of Israel, the women, the children, and those who dwelled among them.<sup>4</sup>

Again it is unclear what was being read here. It could be just the section of Deuteronomy pertaining to the blessings and curses or as much as the entire Torah that is intended here. Either way, the context is a one-time event, and there is nothing to indicate that this was part of any periodic ritual.

A similar example of a public Torah reading is described, taking place many centuries later, when King Josiah is made aware of a “Book of Teaching” and holds a public reading:

וַיַּעַל הַמֶּלֶךְ בֵּית־יְי וְכָל־אִישׁ יְהוּדָה וְכָל־יֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם אִתּוֹ, וְהַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַנְּבִיאִים, וְכָל־הָעָם, לְמַקְטֹן וְעַד־גָּדוֹל; וַיִּקְרָא בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם, אֶת־כָּל־דְּבָרֵי סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית, הַנִּמְצָא, בְּבֵית יְי.

And the king went up to the House of ADONAI, and all the men of Judah, and all who dwelled in Jerusalem [went] with him; and the priests and the prophets and the entire people, from the low to the great. And he read in their hearing all the words of the Book of the Covenant that was found in the House of ADONAI.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Mishnah Sotah 7:8 does provide this information.

<sup>4</sup> Joshua 8:35.

<sup>5</sup> II Kings 23:2.

Again, the sense seems to be a one-time event, and it is unclear what this “Book of the Covenant” actually was, though it would certainly seem to contain at least some of the content we now consider part of the Torah.

In order to find another Biblical example of public Torah reading, we need to go to nearly the end of the Biblical period. Chapter 8 of the book of Nehemiah describes a public Torah reading by Ezra the Scribe on the first and second days of the seventh month. Of note is that Ezra blesses God before the reading and “וַיְבִינֵנוּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ בְּסֵפֶר בְּתוֹרַת הָאֱלֹהִים, מִפֶּרֶשׁ; וְשׁוֹם” “בְּמִקְרָא”, “They read in the book, in the Teaching of God, explaining, and gave the meaning so they understood the reading.”<sup>6</sup> It is possible that this description means that the reading was translated into Aramaic, the common language of the time, and seems to describe that an explanation or commentary for the reading was provided. There is again no indication in the text that a weekly Torah reading was in effect at this time, though the Talmud claims “עזרא התקין” “Ezra established for Israel that they will be reading the Torah on Monday, Thursday, and Shabbat afternoon”, presuming that the Torah was already being read on Shabbat morning prior to this.<sup>7</sup>

### *Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century*

The 1st century Jewish philosopher Philo seems to reference a Shabbat Torah reading in his works:

Accordingly, on the seventh day there are spread before the people in every city innumerable lessons of prudence, and temperance, and courage, and justice, and all other virtues; during the giving of which the common people sit down, keeping silence and pricking up their ears, with all possible attention, from their thirst for wholesome instruction; but some of those who are very learned ex-

---

<sup>6</sup> Nehemiah. 8:8.

<sup>7</sup> Talmud Y’rushalmi Megillah 29a.

plain to them what is of great importance and use, lessons by which the whole of their lives may be improved.<sup>8</sup>

What then did he do on this sabbath day? He commanded all the people to assemble together in the same place, and sitting down with one another, to listen to the laws with order and reverence, in order that no one should be ignorant of anything that is contained in them; and, in fact, they do constantly assemble together, and they do sit down one with another, the multitude in general in silence, except when it is customary to say any words of good omen, by way of assent to what is being read. And then some priest who is present, or some one of the elders, reads the sacred laws to them, and interprets each of them separately till eventide; and then when separate they depart, having gained some skill in the sacred laws, and having made great advancements towards piety.<sup>9</sup>

It seems that in early 1st century Alexandria, a Shabbat Torah reading was already commonplace. The reading was apparently performed by someone of high status, and was followed by a scholarly explanation of what was read that lasted the rest of the day. This does not tell us whether the Torah was read in a cycle or the length of such a cycle, but only establishes that the institution of a weekly reading was in place by this time period.

Overlapping the same time period is the 1st century historian Josephus, who also attests to a weekly Torah reading:

...but demonstrated the law to be the best and the most necessary instruction of all others, permitting the people to leave off their other employments, and to assemble together for the hearing of the law, and learning it exactly, and this not once or twice, or oftener, but every week; which thing all the other legislators seem to have neglected<sup>10</sup>

This sheds no further light on the implementation of the weekly readings, but provides confirmation that they were occurring in this time period and were widespread, as Josephus lived in Roman Judea.

---

<sup>8</sup> Philo, Ed. Charles Duke Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus*, Vol. III, London: H.G. Bohn, 1855, 270.

<sup>9</sup> Philo, Ed. Charles Duke Yonge, *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus*, Vol. IV, London: H.G. Bohn, 1855, 217-218.

<sup>10</sup> Flavius Josephus, William Whiston, Trans., *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, Auburn and Buffalo: John E. Beardsley, 1860, 815.



The Christian Bible also sheds some light on 1st century Torah reading. The Book of Acts explicitly relates, “For the law of Moses has been preached in every city from the earliest times and is read in the synagogues on every Sabbath.”<sup>11</sup> Our earliest reference to a subsequent reading from the Prophets (*haftarah*) can be found in the same book: “...and on the Sabbath day they went into the synagogue and sat down. After the reading from the Law and the Prophets, the leaders of the synagogue sent word to them ‘Brethren, if you have any word of exhortation for the people, say it.’”<sup>12</sup> It would appear that by the late 1<sup>st</sup> century, the Shabbat reading process included a *haftarah* reading and that addresses by scholars followed that. It is inconclusive at what point in time the *haftarah* began to be read, and it could certainly have been the case in the times of Philo and Josephus, but were simply not mentioned by them.

The Book of Luke confirms the *haftarah* as part of the Shabbat reading institution and provides further information as it describes Jesus reading from the Prophets on Shabbat:

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and as was his custom, he entered the synagogue on the Sabbath, and stood up to read. And the book of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. And he opened the book and found the place where it was written [Isaiah 61:1-2] And he closed the book, gave it back to the attendant and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him.<sup>13</sup>

It is unclear from this passage whether the Isaiah passage was already selected and Jesus is simply reading the appropriate portion for the day, or whether he was given the scroll for Isaiah and had discretion as to where to begin reading and he needed to roll the scroll to the desired place. Thus, it is an open question as to whether at this point in time, the *haftarot* for the weekly reading were already fixed, and, for that matter, whether the Torah divisions for the weekly readings were fixed. The only clue we have is that it seems it was predetermined that the reading was to be from Isaiah.

---

<sup>11</sup> 15:21.

<sup>12</sup> 13:15-16.

<sup>13</sup> 4:16-20.

### *Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the Tannaitic Period*

There can be no question that by the Tannaitic Period, a weekly Torah reading cycle was already in effect and that the institution of a *haftarah* was already in place. Much of the information we have on this comes from the tractate of Megillah in the Mishnah and Tosefta, as well as *baraitot* from that period referenced in the corresponding section of the two Talmuds. These texts establish the rules and procedures for the Torah reading, but they do not provide any information on the content of the weekly readings, nor how long it took to complete a reading cycle. Nevertheless, they provide essential information for understanding how the Sequential Triennial Cycle was practiced and informs any effort to revive such a cycle.

The following *mishnah*, which specifically addresses cases where the regular cycle is interrupted, helps us establish that there *was* a regular cycle of readings in the first place:

ראש חודש אדר שחל להיות בשבת, קורין בפרשת שקלים; חל להיות בתוך השבת, מקדימין לשעבר ומפסיקין לשבת אחרת. בשנייה, "זכור"; בשלישית, "פרה אדומה"; ברביעית, "החודש הזה". בחמישית, חוזרין לכסדרן. לכול מפסיקין--לראשי חודשים, ולחנוכה, ולפורים, לתעניות, ולמעמדות, וליום הכיפורים

Rosh Ḥodesh Adar that falls so that it is on Shabbat: we read in the section of “Sh’kalim”; if it falls during the week, we bring it earlier to the previous [Shabbat] and interrupt [the four special Shabbat portions] on the following week. On the second [special Shabbat], [we read] “Zakhor,” on the third, “Parah Adumah,” on the fourth “Ha-Ḥodesh Ha-Zeh,” and on the fifth, we return to [reading] according to their order. For all, we interrupt [the regular readings]: for Rashei Ḥodesh, for Ḥanukkah, for Purim, for fasts, for *ma-amadot*, and for Yom Kippur.<sup>14</sup>

It should be noted that there is some ambiguity in the text as to what is being interrupted. It could be referring to either the cycle of Torah readings or a cycle of haftarah readings. Since the key words of the four Torah portions are provided, it seems likely that the first part of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Mishnah Megillah 3:4.

*mishnah* is referring to the cycle of Torah readings, and in fact, a similar passage from the Tosefta specifies explicitly that not only are the Torah readings special on those four weeks, but it also provides the beginnings of four special *haftarot* for those weeks.<sup>15</sup>

The second part could be assumed to be about the cycle of Torah readings by association, but it remains somewhat more ambiguous. If it does instead refer to *haftarot*, it does seem to imply a reasonably fixed cycle of *haftarot* associated with the Torah readings at this early stage, rather than the *haftarah* reader selecting the text on the fly. Current practice with regard to all of these occasions (if and when they fall on Shabbat) is that we read the normal weekly Torah portion on all occasions mentioned except Yom Kippur, reading a special section of the Torah in addition to the weekly section. We do, however, preempt the regular weekly *haftarah* entirely in all of these scenarios. We cannot, however, necessarily assume that later practice informs us how to read the *mishnah* with regard to Tannaitic practice. It is possible that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was interrupted on some or all of these occasions, which would have an impact on the duration of a complete cycle, or perhaps the number of *s'darim* required for a cycle of fixed duration.

Another passage from the Tosefta on the same subject gives us our earliest hint of a reading cycle that is not fixed to the calendar:

היתה פ' שקלים סמוכה לאדר בין מלפניה בין מלאחריה קורין אותה וחוזרין  
וכופלין אותה וכן בשניה וכן בשלישית וכן ברביעית וכן בפורים...

If Parashat Sh'kalim was [on a week] adjacent to Adar, whether it was before it or after it, we read it and return and double it [i.e. read it again]. And so with the second [special Shabbat], and so with the third, and so with the fourth, and so on Purim...<sup>16</sup>

While this passage does not explicitly reference a triennial cycle, given that the four special readings come from different parts of the Torah, the only way that a special portion can be read on an adjacent week to the same portion in its place in the weekly cycle would be in a cycle

---

<sup>15</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:1.

<sup>16</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:2.

that is not fixed to the calendar year or that lasts more than a year and in which the portions of the cycle containing those four passages can fall during Adar of different years of the cycle. Either way, we are clearly talking about something other than an annual cycle that starts and ends in the fall.

Yet, there appears to be contradictory information in a *baraita*:

ר' שמעון בן אלעזר אומר עזרא תיקן להן לישראל שיהו קורין קללות שבתורת כהנים קודם עצרת ושבמשנה תורה קודם ר"ה [=ראש השנה]  
Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: Ezra decreed for Israel that they will read the curses in Torat Kohanim [i.e. Leviticus] prior to Atzeret [i.e. Shavuot] and those in Mishneh Torah [i.e. Deuteronomy] prior to Rosh Hashanah.<sup>17</sup>

There are at least three ways to understand this *baraita*. Perhaps the most straightforward way is that there must be an annual cycle of Torah readings in which the portions containing the curses are aligned to fall prior to the indicated holidays. Other possibilities would be a longer cycle in which the Leviticus curses fall prior to Shavuot during one year of the cycle and the Deuteronomy ones fall prior to Rosh Hashanah in another and that these sections are read in addition to or instead of the regular readings of the cycle on the weeks prior to these two holidays. The first two explanations would be difficult to square with a triennial cycle.

The Mishnah provides other instructions that are informative about the Torah reading system during that period and beyond:

... אין מפסיקין בקללות, אלא אחד קורא את כלן. בשני ובחמישי ובשבת  
במנחה, קורין כסדרן ואין עולין להם מן החשבון...

... We do not break within the curses, rather one [reader] reads all of them. On Monday, Thursday, and at Shabbat *minḥah* we read according to their order, and we do not total them in the accounting...<sup>18</sup>

That we are not permitted to break within the section of the curses (here, the reference could be to either set of curses), is pertinent to the division of the readings for the seder in which

---

<sup>17</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 31b.

<sup>18</sup> Mishnah Megillah 3:6.

they fall. The latter part brings up the question of how the three other weekly readings fit into the reading cycle. While it is unclear how to understand “according to their order,” it seems clear that whatever is read during these readings is not to affect the continuous cycle of reading on Shabbat morning. Since the context of this *mishnah* is the Festival readings, it is conceivable that the latter part is only referring to the case of these readings during weeks where a special Festival reading replaces the normal Shabbat one – that these three readings continue to follow the weekly reading cycle, but on the week after the special reading, the Shabbat morning reading picks up as it would have if there had not been a Festival.

Once again, the Tosefta sheds more light on this:

...מקום {שפוסקין בשבת בשחרית משם מתחילין} במנחה במנחה {משם מתחילין} בשני בשני {משם מתחילין} בחמישי בחמישי {משם מתחילין בשבת הבאה ר' יהודה אומר מקום שפוסקין בשבת בשחרית משם מתחילין לשבת הבאה.

The place {that we stop on Shabbat during Shaḥarit, from there we begin} during [Shabbat] Minḥah; at Minḥah {from there we begin on Monday}; on Monday {from there we begin} on Thursday, on Thursday {from there we begin on the Shabbat [morning] that follows. Rabbi Y’udah says: the place that we stop on Shabbat during Shaḥarit, from there we begin for the Shabbat [morning]} that follows.<sup>19</sup>

We see here that the readings at Shabbat *minḥah*, Monday mornings, and Thursday morning on ordinary weeks were different from each other, starting from the end of the portion from the prior Shabbat. We then have some essential information on how the Torah reading cycle worked: there were actually two different systems in use. In the first, the aforementioned three readings were a full part of the reading cycle, and the Shabbat morning reading picked up where the Thursday reading left off. In the second, the three readings were not part of the cycle, and so the Shabbat morning reading picked up where the previous Shabbat morning left off (with the exception of weeks where a special reading interrupted the cycle). These are presented as the on-

---

<sup>19</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:4.

ly two options, and thus, the Torah must be read in a continuous fashion from one Torah reading to the next.

The *mishnah* on this topic can then perhaps be understood as teaching the second of the two practices: that the three readings do not count towards the “accounting” of the Torah read from week to week and we go back to where we left off on the previous Shabbat. It could also be understood as specifically providing instructions for weeks when the normal Shabbat reading is interrupted and directing us to continue reading according to the normal cycle (whichever of the two is being employed) for these days, but to return and repeat them the following week.

The Mishnah continues to supply us with information on the Torah reading process:

בראשי חדשים ובחלו של מועד, קורין ארבעה. אין פוחתין מהן ואין מוסיפין עליהן, ואין מפטירין בנביא... ביום טוב, חמשה. ביום הכפורים, ששה. בשבת, שבעה. אין פוחתין מהן, אבל מוסיפין עליהן, ומפטירין בנביא...

On Rashei Ḥodesh and the ordinary days of Festivals, four read. We do not subtract from them, nor do we add to them. And we do not conclude in the Prophets... On Yom Tov, five; on Yom Kippur, six; on Shabbat, seven. We do not subtract from them, but we may add to them. And we conclude in the Prophets...<sup>20</sup>

Here, we learn that in this period, a Shabbat portion already required seven readers. The Tosefta stresses that even if only one person is capable of reading the Torah, that person must sit down in between each reading, presumably to maintain the count of seven readings, despite the fact there is a single reader.<sup>21</sup> This will be key to understanding the lengths of the *s'darim* and how to subdivide them for the seven readers. We also have a clear statement that in this period, on Shabbat and Festivals, a *haftarah* was read from the Prophets.

There is no mention in the Tannaitic texts of specific *haftarot* for occasions other than the four special weeks starting around the beginning of Adar<sup>22</sup>, as well as Festivals and other special

---

<sup>20</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:2.

<sup>21</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:6.

<sup>22</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:1.

occasions.<sup>23</sup> It is notable that the Torah reading and *haftarah* specified for the second day of Sh'mini Atzeret (in the Diaspora)<sup>24</sup> are Deuteronomy 33:1 (*v'zot ha-b'rakhah...*) and I Kings 8:22, respectively. This Torah reading does not necessarily indicate an annual cycle that ends on this day. It is possible that the last chapters of the Torah were used because this was the end of the cycle of holidays. It is also possible that the text itself is corrupt and reflects “updates” made in a later period. The *haftarah* differs from modern practice where on the last day of Sh'mini Atzeret, the first chapter of Joshua is read. Both points of information give us some idea what might have been read on the last day of Sh'mini Atzeret in the early period, before it became “Simḥat Torah” for the Annual Cycle.

It is unclear whether in this period the *haftarot* used as part of the weekly reading cycle were generally fixed or fluid or a mixture of the two, but the codification of *haftarot* for special occasions, and lack of any known codification for weekly *haftarot* strongly suggests that the ones for special occasions were fixed at an earlier point in time than the weekly ones.

The Mishnah adds to our understanding of the parameters of the weekly reading:

הקורא בתורה לא יפחות משלשה פסוקים. לא יקרא למתרגמן יותר מפסוק אחד, ובנביא שלשה. היו שלשתן שלש פרשיות, קורין אחד אחד. מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה. ועד כמה הוא מדלג, עד כדי שלא יפסוק התרגמן.

One who reads from the Torah [should not read] less than three verses. He shall not read to the translator more than verse; and in the Prophets, three verses, but if the three of them constituted three paragraphs, they read them one by one. We skip in the Prophets, but we do not skip in the Torah. And how much may he skip? Only as long as the translator has not stopped [translating the previous verse(s)].<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> *baraitot* cited in Talmud Bavli Megillah 31a-31b.

<sup>24</sup> The mention of the second day of Yom Tov in a *baraita* is something of an anachronism. The passage in the Bavli intersperses some Aramaic comments that are no doubt Amoraic into the text of the *baraita*, and it is likely that even though the mention of the second day of Sh'mini atzeret is in Hebrew, it too is actually of Amoraic origin. This does not really have any impact on the significance of the citation either way.

<sup>25</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:4.

We can now see that since each reader may not read less than three verses, so that each weekly portion recited in the cycle would seem to require a minimum of 21 verses, while readings for other occasions could be shorter. We also are introduced explicitly to the concept of an official translator who translates the Torah verse-by-verse and the *haftarah* in groups of up to three verses into the vernacular, which may be modeled on the Nehemiah passage regarding Ezra's reading. Finally, we learn that during a specific week's Torah reading, that the reading must be from a continuous section, while the *haftarah* was less limited.

The Tosefta provides additional information on the division of the weekly reading amongst readers:

אין קורין בתורה פחות משלשה פסוקין {בכרך אחד} אם היתה פרשה של ארבע ושל חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולה היתה פרשה של חמשה וקרא שלשה והניח את השנים העומד אחריו לקרוא קורא אותן שנים ועוד שלשה בפרשה אחרת אם היתה פרשה של ארבעה ושל חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולה אין מפטירין בנביא פחות משלשה פסוקים {בכרך אחד} אם היתה פרשה של ארבעה ושל חמשה {פסוקין} הרי זה קורא את כולה המקצר הרי זה משובח {אם היתה פרשה קטנה} כגון כה אמר ה' חנם נמכרתם {קורא אותה בפני עצמה}.

We do not read in the Torah less than three verses {in one bundle}. If there was a paragraph of four or five [verses]: behold, this one reads all of it. If there was a paragraph of five and he [mistakenly] read three, and leaves over the two that remain after it to read, one [i.e. the next reader] reads those two and another three from the following paragraph. If it [i.e. the following paragraph] was a paragraph of four or five: behold, this one reads all of it. We do not conclude in the Prophets less than three verses {in one bundle}. If there was a paragraph of four or five {verses}: behold, this one reads all of it....<sup>26</sup>

Here we learn that paragraphs of four or five verses cannot intentionally be split between two different readers. It is not clear whether at this time it was normal for a reader to read only three verses, and thus each reader read three to five verses only, or if this was just a minimum. If there were already designated *s'darim* for each week at this time, then it seems likely that readers

---

<sup>26</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:9.



would have needed to read more than the minimum, but it is also possible that the divisions were based around these minimums. We also learn the minimum length of a *haftarah* in this time was only three verses, but similar to the Torah, a paragraph of four or five verses must be read in its entirety.

A *baraita* cited in the Bavli, however, give us a different minimum length of a *haftarah*: “המפטיר בנביא לא יפחות מעשרים ואחד פסוקין כנגד שבעה שקראו בתורה” “The one who concludes in the Prophets: not less than 21 verses corresponding to the seven who read in the Torah.”<sup>27</sup> These two *baraitot* seem irreconcilable, and we must assume they represent different views, possibly corresponding to different times and/or places.

The Tosefta provides more details about skipping in the *haftarah*:

מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה {ואין} מדלגין מנביא לנביא ובנביא של שנים  
עשר {מדלגין} ובלבד שלא ידלג מסוף הספר {לראשו}.

We may skip in the Prophets, but we do not skip in the Torah, and we {do not} skip from one prophet [i.e. prophetic book] to another, but with a prophet of the Twelve Minor Prophets, we skip [from one to another], provided that one does not skip from the end of the book [back] to its beginning.<sup>28</sup>

The fact that we are provided general rules for a *haftarah* selection at all suggests that the selections were not yet fixed. The Mishnah also provides a list of sections which are forbidden to use as *haftarot* and which are permitted as long as they are not translated,<sup>29</sup> again suggesting that selections were still fluid, perhaps being left up to the reader, local rabbinic authority, and/or community. This could have been on an ad hoc basis or it could have been a process by which a community established a *haftarah* reading which would be repeated on subsequent cycles as well. There is too little information to draw any firm conclusions.

To complicate things more, the Mishnah tells us of a Torah reading where three people are to read eight verses. The readings for the week of the *ma-amadot* are designated as to be

---

<sup>27</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 23a.

<sup>28</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:11.

<sup>29</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:10.

from the beginning of Genesis, and we are told that each day two paragraphs were read: “ביום הראשון, בראשית ויהי רקיע. בשני, יהי רקיע ויקוו המים...”<sup>30</sup> “On the first day [the paragraphs of] ‘In the beginning’ and ‘Let there be an expanse’; on the second, ‘Let there be an expanse’ and ‘Let the water be gathered...’”<sup>30</sup> The number of readers is not explicitly told to us, but the normal weekday number is three<sup>31</sup>, and it seems unlikely there would be less on this occasion, but on these first two days, when there are eight verses to be read on each day, it is impossible to have three readers each read three verses without repetition or going beyond the prescribed paragraphs. This is problematic, and it is unclear how to understand this.

The Tosefta also provides information about rules for divisions pertaining to the conclusion of each book of the Torah:

אין משיירין בסוף הספר אלא כדי שיקראו שבעה שייר כדי שיקראו ששה קורא  
 אותן ששה ועוד שבעה בחומש {אחד} אין משיירין בסוף התורה אלא כדי  
 שיקראו שבעה שייר כדי שיקראו ששה וקראו אותן ששה חוזר הענין וקורא  
 אותן שבעה.

We do not leave over at the end of the book other than so that they will read seven. [If] one left over so that they will read six, then one reads those six and another seven in {a single} book of the Torah [i.e. the next one]. We do not leave over at the end of the Torah other than so that they will read seven, [If] one left over so that they will read six, and they read those six, one returns to the beginning of the matter and reads those seven.<sup>32</sup>

This *baraita* implicitly provides us with critical information. If there were already fixed divisions for the Torah reading, then it would be wholly unnecessary to give instructions teaching how much to leave over at the end of each book.<sup>33</sup> Thus, it seems likely that in this time period, the divisions of the readings from week to week had not been standardized. It is also of note

---

<sup>30</sup> Mishnah Ta’anit 4:3.

<sup>31</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:1.

<sup>32</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:10.

<sup>33</sup> Note that at least 21 verses (7 readers x 3 verses) would be required, but Exodus would have required more since it contains a paragraph of 5 verses at its end. Other rules pertaining to dividing the readings may have required more verses left over at the end of a book as well.

that the solution to leaving too little at the end is not to repeat some of the verses to make up the extra reading, but that when possible, a full seven readings from one book must be read, and where not (the end of the Torah), the entire section must be reread.<sup>34</sup>

In summary, we have seen that in this period:

- There was a continuous cycle of Torah readings on Shabbat morning.
- The divisions of the Torah to be read from week to week were not yet fixed.
- There were no gaps/skips permitted from one week to another, but there was disagreement as to whether the Shabbat afternoon, Monday, and Thursday readings were to be a full part of the cycle or whether the entire Torah was to be read across Shabbat mornings only.
- At least seven readers came to the Torah, each reading at least three verses, and a paragraph of four or five verses was to be read by one reader.
- The sections of the curses were required to be read at specific times of year.
- The sections of the curses were not divided among readers.
- On at least one special occasion, the designated reading was impossible to divide over the required number of readers such that each had three non-repeating verses.
- A section from the Prophets (*haftarah*) was read on Shabbat morning, consisting of a minimum of either 21 or three verses, but in the latter case a paragraph of four or five was read in its entirety.
- It was permitted to skip forward a limited number of verses within the same book of the Prophets (counting the 12 Minor Prophets as one book), but not in the Torah reading.
- A translator was in use for both the Torah and *haftarah* readings.

---

<sup>34</sup> Presumably starting from the beginning of the passage we know as “V’Zot Ha-B’rakha” even if the original reading began later than that.

- The regular cycle of Torah readings was interrupted some weeks for special portions (based on the calendar), and there were also special *haftarot*.
- During Adar, the cycle could apparently be in the midst of any of: Exodus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy.

It is important to remember that during this period, practice was not necessarily uniform over time or place, so it is possible that there was not even a single place and time where every one of these principles was followed. Indeed, the few sources that we have from this period may not even give us a full picture of the variety of practices common in this time period; there may be different practices which were not recorded in any sources that have come down to us. It seems that what we can conclude is that there was a Torah reading cycle in place that did not yet have fixed divisions and which did not last exactly one year. We cannot determine whether this was a triennial cycle at all, let alone whether it was fixed to calendar in any way. It is possible that the Torah was simply read following the general rules until the end was reached, and restarted thereafter. It is difficult to say how long this might have taken, but one possibility is that it happened to take three to four years, which led to a more fixed triennial cycle later. It is possible that traditions were already developing concerning locations for weekly reading divisions, subdivisions for readers, and *haftarot* associated with certain passages, but we have no information on this, and it is equally possible that they were improvised. It is also uncertain whether multiple communities followed the same reading schedule or every community read independently.

### ***Reading the Torah and Haftarah in the Amoraic Period***

It is in the Amoraic period that we find our earliest explicit reference to there being two different cycles with Eretz Yisrael following a cycle lasting “three years”.<sup>35</sup> Neither Talmud elaborates on the particulars of this cycle, so any information we have is only obtained by circumstantial evidence. In fact, we do not even know for certain that the triennial cycle was used

---

<sup>35</sup> Talmud Bavli, Megillah 29b, mentioned above.

exclusively within Eretz Yisrael or that the Annual Cycle was not in use in some places there as well. Furthermore, we have little information as to how uniform the cycle was in different localities.

One thing the Talmud does do is to clarify for us some of the conflicting information that we identified with regard to the Tannaitic period. While it is possible that these resolutions accurately describe why there were two conflicting references in the Tannaitic literature, it is equally possible that they are later resolutions and/or harmonizations of conflicting opinions and were not informed by the historical facts.

Regarding the Tannaitic dispute over whether the Torah readings at Shabbat Minḥah and on Mondays and Thursdays are part of the cycle, the Talmud concludes: “אמר רבי זירא הלכה” “מקום שמפסיקין בשבת שחרית שם קורין במנחה ובשני ובחמישי ולשבת הבאה” “Rabbi Zeira said, ‘The *halakhah* is that the place that we stop on Shabbat at Shaḥarit, there we read at Minḥah, on Monday, on Thursday, and on the following Shabbat.’”<sup>36</sup> There is no further argument, and thus this appears to codify that the Torah reading cycle in its entirety must be read on Shabbat, and read sequentially with no skipping from one Shabbat to the next.

The question of the minimum number of verses in a *haftarah* is addressed by both Talmuds. The Bavli discusses the *baraita* requiring a minimum of 21 verses for the *haftarah*:

מתקיף לה רבא והרי עולותיכם ספו דלא הויין עשרין וחד וקרינן  
שאני התם דסליק עניינא  
והיכא דלא סליק עניינא לא והאמר רב שמואל בר אבא זמנין סגיאיין הוה  
קאימנא קמיה דר' יוחנן וכי הוה קרינן עשרה פסוקי אמר לן אפסיקו  
מקום שיש תורגמן שאני דתני רב תחליפא בר שמואל לא שנו אלא  
במקום שאין תורגמן אבל מקום שיש תורגמן פוסק:

Rava raised an objection: “And behold ‘Add your burnt-offerings...’ which does not have 21 in it and we read [it].”

It is different there, because the subject is settled [in less than 21].

---

<sup>36</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 31b.

And where the subject is not settled, not? Did not Rav Sh'muel b. Abba say 'Many times, I was standing before Rabbi Yoḥanan, and when we had read ten verses, he said, 'Stop!'

A place that has a translator is different, as Rav Taḥlifa b. Sh'muel taught, "They did not teach it other than in place with no translator, but a place that has a translator, he may stop [after ten verses]."<sup>37</sup>

Here we are given two exceptions to the rule of 21 verses: if the subject matter of the *haftarah* is complete in less than 21 verses, it may be stopped at that point; and if there is a translator in use, the *haftarah* may be truncated to 10 verses. The reference to Rabbi Yoḥanan appears to place this practice relatively early, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Additionally, Rava makes mention of a specific *haftarah* that begins with Jeremiah 7:21. In the Annual Cycle today, a *haftarah* beginning with this verse is used for Parashat Tzav in all rites, and that *parashah* is indeed less than 21 verses; however, this may or may not have been associated with that specific *parashah* in Rava's time. All we can conclude was that a *haftarah* beginning with that verse was used in connection with *some* Torah reading, and it seems likely that it was a well-known choice if Rava uses it as an example without challenge. This could suggest that there were already some traditions regarding *haftarot* for weekly readings in place (for the Annual Cycle, at least), in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century.

The Y'rushalmi also addresses the question of the minimum length of a *haftarah*, for which there were Tannaitic sources for both three and 21 verses:

התיב רבי חנניה בן פזי והתנינן המפטיר בנביא לא יפחות מעשרים ואחד  
פסוקין  
הוא אמרה ואמר טעמא כשאין שם תורגמן אבל אם יש שם תורגמן  
קוראים שלשה אמר רבי חלבו קומי רבי אבהו קומי רבי יוחנן קראיי תלתא א"ל  
ולא יהא רבי יוחנן כתורגמן:

Rabbi Hananyah b. Pazi responded, "And did we not learn, 'The one who concludes in the Prophets [i.e. reads the haftarah]: [reads] not less than 21 verses.'?"

He said it and he gave a reason: when there is no translator, but if there is a translator there, one reads three [verses].

Rabbi Helbo said before Rabbi Abbahu: Before Rabbi Yoḥanan they [only] read three [verses]?!

---

<sup>37</sup> Talmud Bavli, Megillah 23b.

He said to him, “And isn't [it since] Rabbi Yoḥanan is like a translator?”<sup>38</sup>

We see here a different version of events concerning Rabbi Yoḥanan where a *haftarah* can be as short as three verses when there is a translator. This version has the added benefit of explaining the conflicting opinions we saw in the Tannaitic period by permitting a minimum of three verses and a minimum of 21 verses to coexist under different scenarios. It also suggests that even without a translator, the reduced number of verses could be in effect if there is an explanation being given by a rabbi.

The Talmud also revisits the question of how many verses of the Torah must be read by a single reader. There are two different cases discussed where an established Torah reading for a special occasion cannot be split for the prescribed number of readers and still follow the rule for paragraphs of four or five verses. The first case was identified in our analysis of the Tannaitic texts with regard to the *ma-amadot*:

בראשית בשנים {מ"ט} ה' פסוקי הוי"ן {ותנן} הקורא בתורה אל יפחות  
מג' פסוקים  
רב אמר דולג ושמואל אמר פוסק ורב דאמר דולג  
מ"ט לא אמר פוסק  
קסבר כל פסוקא דלא פסקיה משה אנן לא פסקינן ליהו  
שמואל אמר פוסק ומי פסקינן  
והאמר רבי חנינא קרא צער גדול היה לי אצל ר' חנינא הגדול ולא התיר  
לי לפסוק אלא לתינוקות של בית רבן הואיל ולהתלמד עשוי  
ושמואל התם טעמא מאי משום דלא אפשר הכא נמי לא אפשר  
ושמואל אמר פוסק מ"ט לא אמר דולג  
גזירה משום הנכנסין וגזירה משום היוצאין  
מיתבי פרשה של ששה פסוקים קורין אותה בשנים ושל חמשה {ביחיד  
ואם} הראשון קורא ג' השני קורא שנים מפרשה זו ואחד מפרשה אחרת וי"א ג'  
לפי שאין מתחילין בפרשה פחות משלשה פסוקין למ"ד דולג לידלוג ולמאן  
דאמר פוסק ליפסוק

<sup>38</sup> Talmud Y'rushalmi 4:3, 75a.

## שאני התם דאית ליה רווחא:

[The paragraph of] “B’reishit” with two [readers], {what is the reason}? It has five verses {and it was taught}, “The one who reads in the Torah: not less than three verses.”<sup>39</sup>

Rav said, “One skips [back and repeats],” and Sh’muel said, “One breaks [in the middle a verse].”

What is the reason [Rav] did not say, “one breaks”?

It was his understanding that any verse that Moses did not break, we may not break.

And Sh’muel said, “One breaks.” Do we break?

Did not Rabbi Ḥanina, the Bible teacher, say, “I had great trouble with Rabbi Ḥanina the Great [over this], and he [still] did not permit me to break [a verse] other than for schoolchildren since they were doing it for practice.”

And Sh’muel [could say]: “Why is it the opinion there? Because it’s not possible [for children to learn the full verse]. So too here [when there are five verses in a paragraph] is not possible.”

And Sh’muel who said “one breaks,” what is the reason he did not say “one skips”?

It is a decree because of those who enter and those who leave [during the reading, so that they do not think the reader they missed read only two verses and believe it is permitted]

They responded [with an objection]: “‘A paragraph of six verses: we read it with two [readers]; and of five [verses] {with a single [reader], and if} the first reads three, the second reads two from this paragraph and one from the following paragraph. And there are those who say three so that they will not begin a paragraph with less than three verses.’ For the one who said ‘one skips [back],’ let him skip, and for the one who says ‘one splits [the verse],’ let him split [but neither is the solution provided in this *baraita!*]”

It is different there, because he has room [to continue].<sup>40</sup>

Thus we learn three possible solutions to a paragraph of five verses that needs to be split over two readers. 1) The middle verse can be split and each half read by one reader, effectively making the minimum amount permitted to be read by one reader two and a half verses.<sup>41</sup> 2) The

---

<sup>39</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:4.

<sup>40</sup> Talmud Bavli Ta’anit 27b-28a.

<sup>41</sup> A similar solution of splitting a verse is floated to solve a similar, but different problem in Y’rushalmi Megillah 4:2, 75a, where Rav Huna teaches that a reading by three readers must contain ten verses. One solution to the division of the *ma-amadot* reading for the first day is to split Genesis 1:5 and 1:8 each into two verses. The reading of the second day; however, apparently cannot be split in a similar way (only 1:8 is available for splitting), and since no resolution is presented, it seems that a) the principle of splitting was limited to specific verses for which there was a precedent for splitting and



middle verse can be read in its entirety by each reader. 3) Two verses can be read with one/three verses from the following paragraph (or, one presumes from the preceding paragraph with sufficient planning). This case of continuing on with the next paragraph is not, however, permitted if there is a set ending point for the day's reading and the paragraph of five verses is the final paragraph. It was not permitted to overrun the end point of the designated reading. This discussion certainly suggests that breaks for each of the readings on a specific day were not yet fixed and were worked out "on the fly". It is inconclusive as to whether end points for the weekly readings were already established at this time since the implied end point that cannot be overrun could only be with regard to reading for special occasions or at the end of a book of the Torah.

This same discussion is revisited with regard to the Torah reading for Rosh Hodesh which must divide three paragraphs of eight, two, and five verses among four readers. In the further discussion, the rule about a paragraph of five verses is clarified as to how it applies to other paragraphs which have a number of verses not divisible by three: "ואין משיירין בפרשה פחות" "משלשה פסוקים" "And we do not leave over less than three verses in a paragraph... And we do not begin a paragraph with less than three verses."<sup>42</sup> With regard to the solution of adding additional verses from the next paragraph, the Talmud, where there was a difference of opinion as to whether only one verse need be added or three, the Talmud informs us, "אמר רבי תנחום אמר ריב"ל הלכה כיש אומרים" "Rabbi Tanḥum said Rabbi Y'hudah b. Levi said, 'the *halakhah* is according to "those who say" [i.e. three verses are to be added from the following paragraph]."<sup>43</sup> It appears that this was indeed also the practice in Eretz Yisrael, where the Sequential Triennial Cycle was reportedly the norm, as the Y'rushalmi does not even debate the number of verses to add, but states outright:

---

b) lacking such a precedent, splitting was not a sufficient solution when there was a set end point, and so repetition is established as the only generally acceptable option in Eretz Yisrael.

<sup>42</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 21b-22a.

<sup>43</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 22a.

היתה הפרשה של ה' פסוקים קורא את כולה לא עשה כן אלא קרא ג' זה שהוא  
עומד תחתיו צריך לקרות שני פסוקים האחרונים וג' מפרשה האחרת

There was a paragraph of five verses: one reads all of it; if one did not do so, but rather read three, the one who stands after him [to read] needs to read the remaining two verses and three from the next paragraph.<sup>44</sup>

In the Bavli, the matter of what to do when there are insufficient verses left before the end of the reading is also decided: “שלח ליה רבה בריה דרבא לרב יוסף הלכתא מאי שלח ליה: “Rabbah, son of Rava sent to Rav Yosef, ‘What is the *halakhah*?’ He sent [back] to him, ‘The *halakhah* is one repeats, and it is the one in the middle who repeats [i.e. not the last reader]”<sup>45</sup>

If the breaks between weekly sections were not set by this time period, then these parameters might have had an influence on the length of weekly readings. Either way, they provide some insight into how the readings for a given day might have been broken down and which verses might have been repeated.

We saw that in the Tannaitic texts, there was some information on specific readings, but only regarding those for special occasions. Additional information on the fixing of specific readings can be found in the Bavli, as it discusses the validity of scrolls that contain only *haftarot*, outside of the full books they are found in.<sup>46</sup> Mentions of Rabbah and Rav Yosef ruling against this practice appear to date this to the late 3rd/early 4th century. This suggests that by this time, there were already set Torah divisions and associated *haftarot* in some or all communities. The amount of variation in these divisions and *haftarot* from community to community, even within Eretz Yisrael or Babylonia cannot be determined from the available information.

In discussing the Mishnah that one may not skip in the Torah, the Talmud deals with a contradictory case:

ורמינהי קורא אחרי מות ואך בעשור והא קא מדלג

---

<sup>44</sup> Talmud Y’rushalmi Megillah 4:5 75b.

<sup>45</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 22a.

<sup>46</sup> Talmud Bavli Gittin 60a.

אמר אביי לא קשיא כאן בכדי שיפסוק התורגמן וכאן בכדי שלא יפסוק

התורגמן

והא עלה קתני מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה ועד כמה הוא מדלג עד

כדי שלא יפסוק התורגמן מכלל דבתורה כלל כלל לא

אלא אמר אביי לא קשיא כאן בענין אחד כאן בשתי עניינות

And throw in this [contradictory example]: “He reads ‘Aḥarei Mot’ and ‘Akh Beh-Asor’<sup>47</sup>. And does he not skip?”

Abaye said, “There is no contradiction [for this reason:] here [i.e. the *mishnah* against skipping] it is in the case that the translator will [need to] stop [before the scroll is rolled], and here [i.e. the *mishnah* about the specific reading] it is in the case that the translator will not [need to] stop.”

But surely regarding this it was taught, “We skip in the Prophets, but we do not skip in the Torah. And how much may he skip? Only as long as the translator has not stopped [translating the previous verse(s)].<sup>48</sup> From this we learn that in the Torah, as a rule, not [to skip]

“Rather,” Abaye said, “there is no contradiction [for this reason]: here [i.e. the *mishnah* about the specific reading] it is one subject [that both passages relate], and here [i.e. the *mishnah* against skipping] it is two [different] subjects [each passage relating one]”<sup>49</sup>

This passage reaffirms the rule against skipping in the Torah within a specific day’s reading, but provides an exception to the rule when the material read is on a single topic despite the skip. While the interpretation of whether two passages are on the same topic might be subjective in some cases, this provides us a general guideline that any Torah reading system cannot systematically skip without regard to content. It should also be noted that while there is no skipping in the current practice for the Yom Kippur Torah reading, the reading for fast days does involve skipping, and the two passages are indeed on one subject.

It appears that in the Amoraic period, the question of whether the weekly cycle was interrupted for special Torah readings or not was not fully resolved:

לסדר מאי

---

<sup>47</sup> Mishnah Yoma 7:1.

<sup>48</sup> Mishnah Megillah 4:4.

<sup>49</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 24a.

ר' אמי אמר לסדר פרשיות הוא חוזר ר' ירמיה אמר לסדר הפטרות הוא

חוזר

אמר אביי כוותי דר' אמי מסתברא דתנן לכל מפסיקין לראשי חדשים  
לחנוכה ולפורים לתעניות ולמעמדות וליוה"כ בשלמא למ"ד לסדר פרשיות הוא  
חוזר היינו דאיכא פרשה בחול אלא למ"ד לסדר הפטרות הוא חוזר הפטרה  
בחול מי איכא ואידך

הא כדאיתא והא כדאיתא

To what order [do we return on the fifth week]?

Rabbi Ami said, "It is to the order of Torah portions that one returns.>";  
Rabbi Yirm'yah said, "It is to the order of *haftarot* that one returns."

Abaye said, "Reason would agree with Rabbi Ami, as it was taught, 'For all, we interrupt [the regular readings]: for Rashei Hodesh, for Hanukkah, for Purim, for fasts, for *ma-amadot*, and for Yom Kippur.' This is in keeping with the one who said, 'It is to the order of Torah portions that one returns.' It corresponds, as there is a Torah portion on an ordinary day [i.e. Monday or Thursday], but for the one who said 'It is to the order of *haftarot* that one returns,' Is there a *haftarah* on an ordinary day? And the other [how does he understand this]?

This one [Torah portions] where it applies [when only the Torah is read], and this one [*haftarot*] where it applies [on days where there is a *haftarah*].<sup>50</sup>

Neither view is invalidated, and no halakhic determination made, thus it seems possible that the Sequential Triennial Cycle could have been preempted by any special readings, including those of the four special Shabbats, in at least some places and times during this period.

The Y'rushalmi also contains a discussion which will prove important in shedding light on the beginnings and endings of *s'darim* and their subdivision among readers:

אין מפסיקין בקללות

אמר רבי חייה בר גמדה אל תקוץ בתוכחו אל תעשה קוצים קוצים  
אמר רבי לוי אמר הקב"ה אינו בדין שיהו בני מתקללין ואני מתברך  
אמר רבי יוסה בי רבי בון לא מטעם הזה אלא זה שהוא עומד לקרות  
בתורה צריך שיהא פותח בדבר טוב וחותם בהדבר טוב

<sup>50</sup> Talmud Bavli Megillah 30b.

לוי בר פסטי שאל לרב הונא אילין ארורייה מהו דיקרינון חד ויברך  
לפניהן ולאחריהן אמר ליה אין לך טעון ברכה לפניו ולאחריו אלא קללות  
שבתורת כהנים וקללות שבמשנה תור'

“We do not break within the curses...”

Rabbi Hiyah bar Gamda said, “Do not be averse to His admonishment’ – do not do [it] piece by piece.”

Rabbi Leivi said. “The Holy One, Blessed be He said, ‘It is not right that my children will be cursed and I am blessed.’”

Rabbi Yose bei Rabbi Bun said, “This has no reason other than that this one who stands to read the Torah needs to open on a good matter and close on a good matter.”

Leivi bar Pasti asked Rav Huna, “These curses, what is [the law] regarding one who will read them and will bless before them and after them?”

He said to him, “You have no requirement of a blessing before it and after it [i.e. an individual reading] other than the curses that are in Torat Kohanim (i.e. Leviticus) and that are in Mishneh Torah (i.e. Deuteronomy).<sup>51</sup>

Here, in the discussion of why we do not put a break in the middle of the curses, we are introduced to the concept that each individual reader should both begin and end on a positive note in the reading. It is unclear whether this is a general rule for all readings or a special rule in this particular case. Normally during this era, the blessings for the Torah reading were recited only before and after the entire reading and not for each individual reading, but it appears from the discussion that it was the practice to do the latter for the readings of the curses. Given that, it seems that the need to start and end on a positive note is, as Rabbi Leivi implies, so there is some positive content associated with blessing God.

There has been much debate and discussion from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to present about the relationship between the *midrash* collections and the Sequential Triennial Cycle. This is with regard to chapters breaking in the same point as *s'darim*, the verses that the *midrashim* are based on being tied to the *s'darim*, and content of a *midrash* being tied to the *seder* and associated *haf-tarah*. This is complicated greatly by the fact that most of the *midrash* collections, in the form they have reached us today, have been reedited and often reorganized according to the Annual Cycle, perhaps by editors unaware of any links between the *midrashim* and the Sequential Triennial

---

<sup>51</sup> Talmud Y'rushalmi 3:8 74b.

nial cycle. It is also notoriously difficult to date the origin of the *midrash* collections and the *midrashim* collected therein. Since much of the discussion regarding the *midrash* collections and the Sequential Triennial Cycle is of a speculative nature and does not explicitly come out of the text, it will be addressed in the section on modern scholarship.

Despite the dating issues, Vayikra Rabbah, one of the *aggadic midrash* collections, is understood to be from somewhere in the mid to late Amoraic period.<sup>52</sup> In it, we find a critical piece of information that informs us about the use of the Sequential Triennial Cycle: “רבי חנינא בר אבא אזל לחד אתר אשכחא הדין פסוקא ראש סדרא, והנותרת מן המנחה לאהרן ולבניו” “מה פתח עלה” “Rabbi Ḥanina bar Abba went to one town to find this verse as the beginning of the *seder*: ‘And the remainder of the grain-offering shall belong to Aaron and his sons’<sup>53</sup> With what [verse] did he open [his teaching] regarding this?”<sup>54</sup> Given the verse is too close to the beginning of the book of Leviticus to be an Annual Cycle reading, this would seem to be the Sequential Triennial Cycle. We learn from this *midrash* that at some point in the Amoraic period, the *seder* breaks could vary from place to place. Given this, it seems likely that not all places that were reading using the Sequential Triennial Cycle read according to the same cycle, and may have been slightly or completely out of sync with each other.

In summary, we have seen that in the Amoraic period:

- The “West” read according to a triennial cycle, while in Babylonia, an annual cycle was used.
- The Torah was read sequentially, beginning on one Shabbat where it left off on the previous one.
- The divisions of the Sequential Triennial Cycle were (at least during some part of this era) not the same from place to place.

---

<sup>52</sup> Marc Bregman, “Midrash Rabbah and the Medieval Collector Mentality”, *Prooftexts*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 64.

<sup>53</sup> Lev. 2:3

<sup>54</sup> Vayikra Rabbah 3:6

- A *haftarah* was read, with a minimum of 21 verses, but could be shorter if the main subject was completed sooner. It could also be truncated to as few as three (according to the Y'rushalmi) or ten (according to the Bavli) verses in a place where the public reading was being translated or (perhaps) expounded upon by a scholar. This also suggests there were places where the reading occurred without a translator.
- No divisions of the Torah were made in paragraphs longer than three verses that were less than three verses from a paragraph break; however, if the paragraph was the last one of reading with a fixed ending point, it could be split across two readers by repeating one or two verses (or perhaps in some cases splitting a verse).
- It is possible that there was a general rule that each reader should begin and end on a positive note (but also possible this was not a general rule).
- By the early 4<sup>th</sup> century, *haftarah* scrolls were being created, suggesting a consistency of practice at least within a given locality, though this could only have been in Babylonia.
- Skipping was only permitted in the Torah on specific occasions and where the topic remained the same before and after the skip.
- It is possible that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was interrupted on the four special Shabbats starting near the beginning of Adar and minor special occasions such as Hanukkah.

In short, there were at least two types of sequential cycle in place: an annual one which was probably fixed to the calendar such that it restarted in the fall, used at least in Babylonia, and a triennial one which may or may not have been fixed to the calendar in any way, and was used at least in Eretz Yisrael. In the case of the latter, at least, there was local variation as to where the breaks were from week to week, and possibly the timing of the whole cycle as well. The *haftarot* of at least some of these cycles for some localities were becoming more fixed at during this period, but we have no details at all on what was read. Similarly, there is little information on where

breaks from week to week or from reader to reader might have occurred, though a system of rules was in place as to where such breaks were permitted, as well as the length of a *haftarah*..

### *The Sequential Triennial Cycle in the Post-Amoraic Period*

Discoveries from the Cairo Genizah have revealed to us that the *payy'tan* Yannai, who lived in Eretz Yisrael, composed a *k'rovah* (a set of Amidah *piyyutim*) to be read on every week of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Because these *k'rovot* follow a set structure, they reveal to us where the *s'darim* and *haftarot* of the cycle began, at least in one specific time and place. Unfortunately, not all of the *k'rovot* were found in the *g'nizah*, and many of the ones found are missing the *piyyutim* or parts thereof that would indicate this information. There is disagreement as to when Yannai lived, but general agreement is that it must have been prior to the Muslim conquest of Eretz Yisrael in the early 630's.<sup>55</sup> There are some few *piyyutim* that have been found which were written by other authors, and also reference *s'darim* and *haftarot* of the Sequential Triennial Cycle, but, Yannai's work is the most extensive that we have. These *piyyutim* are possibly the earliest hard data we have on *seder* breaks and the associated *haftarot*. Unfortunately, the *k'rovot* provide no information as to where the *haftarot* ended, nor about any skipping within them.

Additionally, his *k'rovot* contain references to either dew or rain in the *piyyut* for the G'vurot section of the Amidah, presumably parallel to the insertion of such a reference in the G'vurot itself. This would seem to place the reading of each *seder* either between Pesah and Sukkot or vice-versa. The chart on the following page shows the information available from the Yannai *k'rovot*. The Torah reading and *haftarah* for Sh'mini Atzeret are also noted, as they provide useful information as to what might have been read as part of the Sequential Triennial Cycle where this day was never associated in any way with completing the cycle of Torah readings, as it eventually was in the Annual Cycle.

---

<sup>55</sup> Ben Zion Wacholder, "Prolegomenon", *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, Volume I*, Ktav Publishing House, Inc.: New York, 1971, XLI.



**Table 1: *S'darim* and *Haftarot* of the Sequential Triennial Cycle in Yannai's *Piyyutim***

Piyyut/Seder Name	Starting verse	Haftarah starting verse	Tal/ Gesh.
צא מן התבה	Genesis 8:15-16 Genesis 9:18	Isaiah 42:7	
ויהי כל הארץ	Genesis 11:1	Zephaniah 3:9	T
קדושתה לך לך	<b>Genesis 12:1</b> Genesis 14:1	<i>Joshua 24:3</i>	T
אחר הדברים האלה: במחזה	Genesis 15:1	Isaiah 1:1	T
ושרי אשת אברם	Genesis 16:1	Isaiah 54:1	T
ויבאו שני המלכים	Genesis 19:1		
וירא יי כי שנואה לאה	Genesis 29:31	[Isaiah 60:15] <sup>56</sup>	
ויזכור אלהים את רחל	Genesis 30:22		
שוב אל ארץ אבתך	Genesis 31:3	Jeremiah 30:10	T
וישלח י...	<b>Genesis 32:4</b>	<i>Obadiah 1:1</i>	T
ויבא יעקב שלם	Genesis 33:18	Nahum 1:12	T
וירא אלהים אל יעקב	Genesis 35:9	Isaiah 43:1	
וישב יעקב	<b>Genesis 37:1</b> Genesis 38:1	<i>Isaiah 32:18</i>	
ויוסף הורד מצרימה	Genesis 39:1	Isaiah 52:3	T
ויגש אליו	<b>Genesis 44:18</b>	<i>Joshua 14:6</i>	G
	Genesis 48:1	II Kings 13:14	T
ויקרא יעקב	Genesis 49:1	Isaiah 43:22	T
ומשה היה	Exodus 3:1	Isaiah 40:11	T
וילך משה	Exodus 4:18		
כי ידבר אליכם	Exodus 7:8 (ref. 9) Exodus 8:16	Joel 3:3	T
ואני הכבדתי את לבו	<b>Exodus 10:1</b> Exodus 12:29	Isaiah 21:11	G
קדש לי	Exodus 13:1 (ref. 2)	Isaiah 46:3 Isaiah 58:13	T

<sup>56</sup> The *haftarah* start verse in the third *piyyut* is not on the fragment, but the verse can be determined based on the words used in the earlier part of the stanza.

Piyyut/Seder Name	Starting verse	Haftarah starting verse	Tal/ Gesh.
ואתם תהיו לי	Exodus 19:6		
	<b>Exodus 21:1</b>	<i>Isaiah 56:1</i>	T
	Exodus 26:1	Isaiah 66:1	T
	Exodus 26:31	Ezekiel 16:10	T
ויתן אל...	Exodus 31:18		
ויפן וירד	Exodus 32:15	II Samuel 22:10	
		[Jeremiah 31:32] <sup>56</sup>	
	<b>Leviticus 1:1</b>	Micah 6:9	
	Leviticus 4:1	[Ezekiel 18:4] <sup>56</sup>	
זה קרבן	Leviticus 6:12 (ref. 13)	Malachi 3:4	T
קח את אהרן ואת בניו	Leviticus 8:1		
זאת תהיה תורת	<b>Leviticus 14:1</b>	Isaiah 57:17	[T]
ונתתי נגע צרעת	Leviticus 14:33-34	Isaiah 5:8	T
כי יהיה זב	Leviticus 15:1-2	Hosea 6:1	T
ואשה כי יזוב זוב דמה	Leviticus 15:25	Ezekiel 16:9	T
כי תבאו אל הארץ	Leviticus 19:23		
אמור אל הכהנים	<b>Leviticus 21:1</b>	<i>Ezekiel 44:25</i>	T
	Leviticus 22:17-18	Isaiah 56:7	T
קדשתא וכי תמכרו ממכר	Leviticus 25:14	Isaiah 24:2	T
וכי ימוך אחיך	Leviticus 25:35	Isaiah 35:3	T
	<b>Leviticus 26:3</b>	Isaiah 1:19	
	<b>Numbers 1:1</b>	<i>Hosea 2:16</i>	T
	Numbers 3:1	Isaiah 45:19	
אל תכריתו	Numbers 4:17		
איש איש כי תש...	Numbers 5:11	Hosea 4:14	
כה תברכו	Numbers 6:22-26	Isaiah 44:3	T
בהעלותך את הנרות	<b>Numbers 8:1</b>		
עשה לך שתי חצוצרות כסף	Numbers 10:1	Isaiah 27:13	T
		[Isaiah 24:23] <sup>56*</sup>	
שלח לך אנשים	<b>Numbers 13:1</b>		
עד ענה ינאצני העם הזה	Numbers 14:11		
וידבר...ועשחתם אשה לה'	Numbers 15:1-3	Isaiah 56:7	
	<b>Numbers 16:1</b>	<i>Hosea 10:2</i>	[T]

Piyyut/Seder Name	Starting verse	Haftarah starting verse	Tal/ Gesh.
וקח מא...	Numbers 17:16 (ref. 17)	Isaiah 11:1	T
ואל הלויים תדבר	Numbers 18:25 (ref. 26)	Isaiah 62:8	T
	Numbers 20:14	Obadiah 1	T
וירא בלק	<b>Numbers 22:2</b>	Micah 7:16	T
מי מנה	Numbers 23:10	Isaiah 49:23	T
פינחס בן אלעזר	<b>Numbers 25:10-11</b>	<i>Malachi 2:5</i>	T
לאלה תחלק הארץ	Numbers 26:52-53	Isaiah 57:13	T
וביום הבכורים	Numbers 28:26		
אלה מסעי	<b>Numbers 33:1</b>		
	Deuteronomy 2:2		
ראה החלותי	Deuteronomy 2:31	Joshua 10:12	[T]
שמע ישראל	Deuteronomy 6:4	Zechariah 14:9	T
	<b>Deuteronomy 7:12</b>	Isaiah 54:10	T
...ל לך שני...	Deuteronomy 10:1	[I Kings 8:9] <sup>56</sup>	
	Deuteronomy 15:7	Isaiah 29:19	T
	Deuteronomy 17:14		
כי יקרא קן ציפור	Deuteronomy 22:6	Isaiah 31:5	T
	Deuteronomy 24:19		
...ע תשמע	Deuteronomy 28:1	Isaiah 55:2	T
	<b>Deuteronomy 29:9</b>		
	Deuteronomy 31:14		
	<b>Deuteronomy 32:1</b>	Isaiah 1:2	T
	<b>Deuteronomy 33:1</b>		
[שמיני עצרת]	Numbers 29:35	I Kings 8:66	T

It is difficult to interpret why only two of the *k'rovot* have a reference to *geshem*/rain and all the others where the reference was preserved have *tal*/dew, including the ones in between the two *geshem* *k'rovot*. Rabinovitz discusses the *tal/geshem* problem as part of his analysis of the *k'rovot*:

Another problem is that is that in Yannai's *k'rovot*, there is almost no mention in the M'ḥayei blessing (*g'vurot g'shamim*) of rain, but only of dew. Also among the newly-found *k'rovot* that we have before us, all of them contain only a mention of dew: "We revived with dew" (*k'rovah* 164), "with dew, You will revive him" (*k'rovah* 94), "With dew, may you live" (*k'rovah* 31), and so on with all of them.

M. Zulay already discovered the strange phenomenon that in the 36 *k'rovot* in which the conclusion for the M'ḥayei blessing was preserved, there is no mention of rain, but only of dew, except for two that look like a later correction, and it cannot be that only by happenstance that the only ones that came to us by chance were *s'darim* that fell during the summer. He came to the conclusion that some of the poets in the Eretz Yisrael had the practice of mentioning dew even in the winter, and based this on Talmud Y'rushalmi, Ta'anit, 1:1, 63a, "That regarding dew, if he wants to mention it, he mentions it," but this was said regarding the summer days only, and for the individual, but not for the prayer-leader or ḥazzan, who have an obligation to mention rain, and, only after the fact, if "he had stood up during 'rain' and mentioned 'dew,' he does not repeat it [including the correct phrase]." Joseph Heinemann conjectures that the poets composed *piyyutim* only for the long Shabbatot of the summer: "whereas during the short Shabbatot of the days of rains, the *ḥazzanim* did not lengthen their prayer, and did not expand it by adding a full set of *piyyutim*." E. Fleischer got it right: "The Torah reading of people of Eretz Yisrael would not have taken but a short while, and even their fixed prayers were very short,' and they had spare time to say *k'rovot* also during the winter days. In my opinion, the mention of dew in Yannai's *piyyutim* for the winter days refers to "dew of life," and not real dew, according to the Talmud Y'rushalmi, Ta'anit, ad. loc., "The dead do not live other than with dews, as it is written, 'Your dead will live; my dead bodies will rise. Awake and rejoice, dwellers in the dust, for your dew is dew of light (Isaiah 26:19).'" It is for this reason that the poet periodically concludes "The reviving of dew," "dew will revive," "reviving the sleeping," "with dews of light, we have revived," or "[to revive] the sleeping with light."<sup>57</sup>

None of these explanations takes into account the fact that all of the *piyyutim* for the holiday/special Shabbat cycle *do* use the appropriate mention of rain/dew for the Shaḥarit Amidah to match what is said in G'vurot on that day. This suggests that originally there were more Shabbat *piyyutim* with rain, but either there was a transition to always using dew or two versions existed for each *seder*, but only the dew versions were preserved (except the two cases we have of rain). If the latter, that would suggest a cycle that was not fixed to the seasons, as would Heinemann's theory that *piyyutim* were only added in the summer months.

With some data now available as to the actual *seder* starting points, we can compare it against the Annual Cycle (at least as it exists today). The places where breaks in both cycles coincide have been bolded in the above chart. Even given the missing *k'rovot*, it is apparent that a good number of the starting points matched. While no firm conclusions can be drawn from this,

---

<sup>57</sup> Translated from Rabinovitz, 13-14.

it suggests that one of the cycles developed out of the other or that there was significant influence by one on the other.

The *haftarot* for those *s'darim*, on the other hand, hardly ever match up with the Ashkenazi/Sephardi *haftarot*, with only three having any overlap at all, and only one (Obadiah 1:1) starting in exactly the same place (these three are also bolded). The now-defunct Romaniote rite, however, which employed the Annual Cycle, used *haftarot* that start with verses matching those of the associated *seder* of the in Yannai *k'rovot* in the majority of cases, and if the *haftarot* tied to the calendar in the Annual Cycle are discounted, then nearly all of them match on the exact verse (matches are italicized above). The starting points for the Karaite *haftarot* for the Annual Cycle are virtually identical to the Romaniote rite. This certainly suggests that those two rites were heavily influenced by the Sequential Triennial Cycle (and possibly each other) and that the *haftarah* selections were relatively stable from Yannai's time onwards.

**Table 2: Romaniote and Karaite *Haftarot* (excluding those tied to calendar)**

Parashah Name	Starting verse	Romaniote <i>haftarah</i> <sup>58</sup>	Karaite <i>haftarah</i> <sup>59</sup>
בראשית	Genesis 1:1	Isaiah 65:17-66:11	Isaiah 65:17-66:13
נח	Genesis 6:9	Isaiah 54:9-55:12	Isaiah 54:9-55:12
לך לך	<b>Genesis 12:1</b>	<b>Joshua 24:3-23</b>	<b>Joshua 24:3-23</b>
וירא	Genesis 18:1	Isaiah 33:17-34:14	Isaiah 33:17-34:12, 35:10
חיי שרה	Genesis 23:1	Isaiah 51:2-22	Isaiah 51:2-22
תולדות	Genesis 25:19	Isaiah 66:12-18 or Isaiah 65:23-66:18	Isaiah 65:23-66:18
ויצא	Genesis 28:10	Hosea 12:13-14:3 or Hosea 12:13-14:5	Hosea 11:7-12:12 or Hosea 12:13-14:10
וישלח	<b>Genesis 32:4</b>	<b>Obadiah 1:1-21</b>	<b>Obadiah 1:1-21</b>
וישב	<b>Genesis 37:1</b>	<b>Isaiah 32:18-33:17 or Isaiah 32:18-33:18</b>	<b>Isaiah 32:18-33:22</b>
מקץ	Genesis 41:1	Isaiah 29:8-30:4 or Isaiah 29:8-30:5 ½	Isaiah 29:7-30:3

<sup>58</sup> Louis Finkelstein, *The Commentary of David Kimhi on Isaiah*, Columbia University Press: New York, 1926, LI; Shlomo Yosef Zevin, *Encyclopedia Talmudit*, Vol. 10, Talmudic Encyclopedia Institute: Jerusalem, 1961, 701-716.

<sup>59</sup> סדר ההפטרות, Yerahah: Kale, 1733.

Parashah Name	Starting verse	Romaniote <i>haftarah</i> <sup>58</sup>	Karaite <i>haftarah</i> <sup>59</sup>
ויגש	<b>Genesis 44:18</b>	<b>Joshua 14:6-15:6 or Joshua 14:6-15:11</b>	<b>Joshua 14:6-15:6</b>
ויחי	Genesis 47:28	II Kings 13:14-14:7	II Kings 13:14-14:7
שמות	Exodus 1:1	Isaiah 27:6-28:13 or Isaiah 27:5-28:13	Isaiah 26:7-27:6 or Isaiah 27:6-28:13
וארא	Exodus 6:2	Isaiah 33:17-34:14 or Isaiah 42:8-43:3 or Isaiah 42:8-43:5	Isaiah 42:8-43:5
בא	<b>Exodus 10:1</b>	Isaiah 34:11-35:10 or Isaiah 34:11-36:6	Isaiah 34:11-35:10
בשלח	Exodus 13:17	Joshua 24:7-26 or Joshua 24:7-28	Joshua 24:7-26
יתרו	Exodus 18:1	Isaiah 33:13-34:10	Isaiah 33:13-34:8
משפטים	<b>Exodus 21:1</b>	<b>Isaiah 56:1-57:10</b>	<b>Isaiah 56:1-57:2 or Isaiah 56:1-57:14</b>
תרומה	Exodus 25:1	Isaiah 60:17-62:3	Isaiah 60:17-61:9
תצוה	Exodus 27:20	Jeremiah 11:16-12:15	Jeremiah 11:16-12:15
כי תשא	Exodus 30:11	Isaiah 43:7-44:20	Isaiah 43:7-44:5
ויקהל	Exodus 35:1	I Kings 8:1-10	I Kings 8:1-19
פקודי	Exodus 38:21	I Kings 7:27-47	Jeremiah 30:18-31:13
ויקרא	<b>Leviticus 1:1</b>	Isaiah 43:21-44:13	Isaiah 43:21-44:22
צו	Leviticus 6:1	Isaiah 66:19-24 or Malachi 3:4-24, 23	Malachi 3:4-24
שמיני	Leviticus 9:1	Ezekiel 43:27-44:21	Ezekiel 43:27-44:16 or Ezekiel 43:27-44:24
תזריע	Leviticus 12:1	Isaiah 66:7-66:24, 66:23	Isaiah 66:7-66:24, 66:23
מצורע	<b>Leviticus 14:1</b>	II Kings 7:3-20 or II Kings 7:1-7:16	II Kings 7:1-18 or II Kings 7:3-18
אחרי מות	Leviticus 16:1	Ezekiel 22:1-20	Ezekiel 22:1-22
קדושים	Leviticus 19:1	Isaiah 4:3-5:17	Isaiah 4:3-5:16
אמור	<b>Leviticus 21:1</b>	<b>Ezekiel 44:25-45:11</b>	<b>Ezekiel 44:25-45:11</b>
בהר	Leviticus 25:1	Isaiah 24:2-23	Isaiah 24:2-23 or Jeremiah 16:19-17:14
בחוקותי	<b>Leviticus 26:3</b>	Isaiah 1:28-2:11 or <b>Isaiah 1:19-2:11</b>	<b>Isaiah 1:19-2:17</b>
במדבר	<b>Numbers 1:1</b>	Hosea 2:1-22	Hosea 2:1-22
נשוא	Numbers 4:21	Judges 13:2-24 or Hosea 4:14-6:2	Judges 13:2-24 or Hosea 4:14-6:2
בהעלותך	<b>Numbers 8:1</b>	Zechariah 2:14-4:7	Zechariah 2:14-4:7
שלח לך	<b>Numbers 13:1</b>	Joshua 2:1-21	Joshua 2:1-15 or Joshua 2:1-24
קרח	<b>Numbers 16:1</b>	<b>Hosea 10:2-11:8</b>	<b>Hosea 10:2-11:9</b>
חקת	Numbers 19:1	Judges 11:1-21	Judges 11:1-17 or Judges 11:1-25
בלק	<b>Numbers 22:2</b>	Micah 5:6-6:8	Micah 5:6-6:8

Parashah Name	Starting verse	Romaniote <i>haftarah</i> <sup>58</sup>	Karaite <i>haftarah</i> <sup>59</sup>
פינחס	<b>Numbers 25:10-11</b>	I Kings 18:46-19:16 or <b>Malachi 2:5-3:8</b>	<b>Malachi 2:5-3:3</b>
מטות	<b>Numbers 30:2</b>	N/A	I Samuel 1:1-2:10
מסעי	<b>Numbers 33:1</b>	N/A	Joshua 20:1-9 or Ezekiel 46:24-47:21
האזינו	<b>Deuteronomy 32:1</b>	II Samuel 22:1-51 or Ezekiel 17:22-18:23	N/A

The bolded *s'darim* and *haftarot* match Yannai.

Even though Yannai only gives us a partial picture of the *s'darim* and *haftarot* in his time, it allows us to gain an understanding of how the *haftarot* were selected in the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Firstly, we note that considerably more than half of the *haftarot* are from the book of Isaiah. Of those, nearly two thirds are from chapter 40 onwards (sometimes called “Second Isaiah”) where the focus is on giving hope to the exiled Israelites for a promised redemption, restoration, and rebuilding of Israel and Jerusalem. It is possible that this resonated with the post-Second Temple inhabitants of Eretz Yisrael, and thus it became a key text for the selection of *haftarot*.

Unlike the Annual Cycle *haftarot* that have come down to us, where the *haftarah* often has a thematic connection to the *parashah*, the Sequential Triennial Cycle’s primary criteria for choosing a *haftarah* seems to be having the same (or a similar) word between the first significant verse in the *seder* and the first (or occasionally second) verse of the *haftarah*. This is known as “verbal tallying”. Sometimes there might be additional linguistic or thematic links between the *seder* and *haftarah*, but it was apparently unnecessary.

As an example, we can look at the first *seder* that Yannai provides, Genesis 12:1, with a *haftarah* beginning at Joshua 24:3. The verses share a reference to Abraham and the word אָרָץ, and the latter is indeed a reference to the former, but the *haftarah* goes on to recap much of Israelite history up to that point, mostly unrelated to the content of the *seder*, but still tying in to “I will make you a great nation” (Gen 12:2). The *haftarah* returns to relevancy with “put away the gods that your ancestors served across the Euphrates” (Josh. 24:14) and the people’s commitment to do so.

An example of a *seder* and *haftarah* with an even more limited connection is Genesis 37:1 and Isaiah 32:18. The first word **וישב** is in common, but there is very little else to connect the two, with the *seder* going on to tell the story of Joseph's coat and his brothers' attempt to kill him and the *haftarah* going on with typical Isaiah fare about the destroyer being destroyed, punishment of sins, and eventual redemption and restoration. At a stretch, the enemies could be connected to Joseph's brothers, but the verbal tallying of the first word seems to be the only criterion for the selection of this *haftarah*.

Massekhet Sof'rim is a post-Talmudic tractate from roughly the 8<sup>th</sup> century, containing laws regarding the reading of the Torah in that time. While it recaps earlier texts, it also adds new information.

החזן שהוא קורא בתורה בשבת פחות משבע קריות ושכח כסבור שקרא ז' יחזור ויקרא וימלא שבע קריות ויפטיר שמיני ובלבד שיהא בסדר עשרים ואחד פסוקים ליתן לכל קורא וקורא שלשה ואם פחות יוסיף על הסדר הזה מפרשה אחרת: ואם היתה הפרשה של ארבעה וחמשה פסוקים קורא את כולה אבל פרשה של ששה פסוקים קורא ומפסיק לפי שיש בה שיעור שתי קריות ואם קרא בשני ובחמישי ובמנחה בשבת ובמנחה של יום טוב פחות מעשרה פסוקים יחזו' ויקר' עד ישלים עשרה פסוקים:

The prayer-supervisor who reads less than seven readings in the Torah on Shabbat, and he forgot and thought that he had read seven: he shall return and shall read, and shall complete the seven readings and the eighth shall conclude [with the *haftarah*]. And provided that in the *seder* there are 21 verses, each and every reader is to be given three; and if less, one adds onto the *seder* from another paragraph. And if there were four or five verses in the paragraph, one reads all of it, but a paragraph of six verses one reads and stops since it has a quantity [of verses] in it for two readings. And if one read on Monday, Thursday, Shabbat Minhah, or Festival Minhah [when there are three readers], less than ten verses, one returns and reads until one completes ten verses.<sup>60</sup>

We learn a number of things from this passage. Firstly we seem to be being told that there were *s'darim* that consisted of less than 21 verses. This also tells us by implication that by this period, there were already fixed *seder* divisions, although it does not tell us how universal they

---

<sup>60</sup> Massekhet Sof'rim 11:4-5.



were. It also tells us that this text originated in a location where the Sequential Triennial Cycle was used for the weekly reading (as the Annual Cycle readings would have been considerably longer than 21 verses).

Although in the Amoraic period, it was seemingly determined that when there are insufficient verses at the end of a fixed portion, one repeats verses, here we are told that one adds three to five verses from the following paragraph on Shabbat. This is rather puzzling, since if a *seder* was given a fixed length of less than 21 verses, and thus one always needed to add some verses from the following paragraph, one would expect that that paragraph would simply be considered part of the *seder* and it would be a *seder* of sufficient verses! Additionally, it is unclear how this would work with the requirement to begin the reading on one Shabbat where it was left off on the previous Shabbat. If one began the following Shabbat after the extra verses that had been added to the short *seder*, then again, it would seem to be that those verses really were part of the prior *seder*.

Perhaps this passage needs to be understood in light of its beginning, in which six readings were mistakenly read instead of seven. Perhaps the problem is that the sixth reader is too far along when it is realized that he is not the last reader, and so the actual last reader has less than three verses. The solution in this case is to add from the following week's reading (though it is still unclear where the following week's reading would actually begin). This would mean that the *seder* actually had sufficient verses, but it was mistakenly read in such a way that the final reader ran out of verses. This would then not raise the question of moving the *seder* division, as it would be a non-standard case. The matter is unclear at best.

The use of a short *haftarah* is also addressed: "תורגמן או דרוש מפטירין בנביא או" "[If there is] a translator or expounding, we conclude in the Prophets with either three verses, five verses, or seven verses and one is not concerned about 21 verses."<sup>61</sup> While we previously saw three or ten verses

---

<sup>61</sup> Massekhet Sofrim 12:6.

acceptable in such scenarios, we now have also five or seven. This also confirms our reading of the passage from the Y'rushalmi that a short *haftarah* is permitted when a rabbi is giving an explanation.

We also find in Massekhet Sof'rim a reference to the number of *s'darim* that the Torah was divided into for the Sequential Triennial Cycle:

אמר ר' יהושוע בן לוי אנא מן יומאי לא איסתכלית גו ספר דאגדתא, אלא חד זמן איסתכלית, ואשתכחית ביה, מאה ושבעים וחמש פרשיות בתורה, דיבור אמירה וציווי. כנגד שנותיו של אברהם אבינו... הילכך קבעו מאה ושבעים וחמשה סדרים בתורה בכל שבת ושבת עולת תמיד.

Rabbi Y'hoshua ben Leivi said, "I, in all my days, did not look within a book of homiletic literature, other than one time I looked and I found in it '175 *parashiyot* in the Torah, speaking, saying, and commanding, corresponding to the years of Abraham, our father...'." Therefore they fixed 175 *s'darim* in the Torah for each and every Shabbat as an eternal burnt-offering.<sup>62</sup>

The first part of this is a quotation from the Y'rushalmi<sup>63</sup> and may in and of itself be a reference to there being 175 *s'darim* in the reading cycle. It is a little unclear, as "*parashiyot*" can have more than one meaning. It is possible, for example, that it is referring to a count of paragraphs starting with speaking, saying or commanding. Massekhet Sof'rim, however, calls this text out and explicitly indicates that this was the basis for the establishment of the number of *s'darim*, suggesting that its author thought there were (or should be) 175 *s'darim* in the cycle. It is also one of the earliest uses that we have on record for the term *seder* with regard to the Sequential Triennial Cycle.

The Gaonic text *החילוקים שבין אנשי מזרח ובני ארץ ישראל* (*The Distinctions Between the People of the East and the Children of Eretz Yisrael*) provides us some additional pieces of information about the Sequential Triennial Cycle:

---

<sup>62</sup> Massekhet Sof'rim 16:8.

<sup>63</sup> Talmud Y'rushalmi, Shabbat 16:1 16c.

א"מ קורין בפרשה שליח צבור והעם, ובני א"י קורין העם פרשה וש"ץ סדרים.  
א"מ עושין שמחת תורה בכל שנה, ובני א"י לג' שנים ומחצה.

The people of the East: the *shaliaḥ tzibbur* and the people read; the children of Eretz Yisrael: the people read a *parashah* and the *shaliaḥ tzibbur s'darim*.

The people of the East: make Simḥat Torah every year; the children of Eretz Yisrael: for three and a half years.<sup>64</sup>

To understand the first part, we need to understand the terminology of *seder* and *parashah*. Certainly in *g'nizah* texts, we see that *parashah* usually refers to a weekly Annual Cycle reading and *seder* refers to a weekly Sequential Triennial Cycle reading. The terms may or may not mean the same thing here. If they do, then we have the puzzling circumstance in Eretz Yisrael of the public Torah reading following one cycle, but the individual's study of the weekly portion following the Babylonian cycle. This does not shed much light on which cycle came first, but (if the terminology holds) suggests that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was already being encroached upon by the Annual Cycle in the Gaonic period.

The second part provides a valuable point of information that the Sequential Triennial Cycle lasted three and a half years, and not three. This could mean one of two things: 1) other references to three years were only approximate or 2) that in some places in times it was completed in three years and in others three and a half. There are also two possibilities for the meaning of three and a half itself: 1) the cycles were worked out to exactly three and a half years, which would allow two cycles to be completed in seven years (connecting to Deuteronomy) or 2) that the cycle finished and restarted whenever all the *s'darim* were completed and the time given is an approximation of the time that typically took.

Another version of this text exists which provides some different information with regard to this second part:

א"מ עושין שמחת תורה בכל שנה ושנה בחג הסוכות ובכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל  
עיר ועיר קורין בפרשה אחת, ובני א"י אין עושים ש"ת אלא לג' שנים ומחצה  
וביום שישלמוהו הפרשה שקורין בפלך זה אין קורין בזה.

---

<sup>64</sup> Mordecai Margulies, *החילוקים שבין אנשי מורה ובני ארץ ישראל*, Rubin Mass: Jerusalem 1938, 88.

The people of the East: make Simḥat Torah each and every year during the Festival of Sukkot and in each and every district and each and every city, they read one *parashah*; the children of Eretz Yisrael: do not make Simḥat Torah other than for three and a half years, and on the day they complete it. The *parashah* that they read in this district, they do not read in this [other] one.<sup>65</sup>

From this, we learn that in the place and time that this text was written, the Sequential Triennial Cycle concluded on an ordinary Shabbat, and not during Sukkot, and that the localities that used it were not in sync with each other and would read different *s'darim*.

The greatest source of information on the Sequential Triennial Cycle is through manuscripts and fragments thereof discovered in the Cairo Genizah. There are a great many documents showing *seder* and *haftarah* breaks, either directly or indirectly. It is difficult to date the time and point of origin of these texts, though it is likely that some came from Old Cairo itself. Of these documents, there are only a few that contain information on more than a handful of *s'darim* or *haftarot*, and none of those contains a complete list. Since they were likely produced in different places and times, we cannot assume that the various parts we have from different documents make up a single set of *s'darim* or *haftarot* that were in use. A comparison of some of the *seder* breaks found in the more complete documents, as well as a summary of the less-complete ones is in the table below. All information has been compiled from original *g'nizah* fragments and not from secondary sources.

**Table 3: The *Seder* Divisions in the *G'nizah* Fragments**

Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup>	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup>	JTS L245 <sup>69</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>70</sup>	Y
--	---	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------	---------------------	---

<sup>65</sup> Margulies 88.

<sup>66</sup> Folio 19a-24a.

<sup>67</sup> Folio 16a-23b.

<sup>68</sup> Folio 24a-31b. This fragment was the basis of Adolph Büchler's analysis (see below).

<sup>69</sup> Folio 9, also known as "Adler Ms. 470."

<sup>70</sup> T-S AS: 2.53, 2.151, 14.14, 14.16, 14.146/147/166, 17.191, 28.106, 50.184, 51.184, 64:149, 66:127/68.122, 70.130, 100.2; T-S A42.2; T-S B: 12.31, 14.12, 15.3, 17.1-7, 17.9, 17.11-30, 17.32, 17.34-40, 18.3; T-S Misc 26.62,

Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup>	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup>	JTS L245 <sup>69</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>70</sup>	Y
					<b>Gen 1:1</b>	
					Gen 2:4	
Gen. 3:22					Gen. 3:22	
Gen. 5:1					Gen. 5:1	
<b>Gen. 6:9</b>		<b>Gen. 6:9</b>			<b>Gen. 6:9</b>	
Gen. 8:1		Gen. 8:1			Gen. 8:1	
Gen. 8:15		Gen. 8:15			Gen. 8:15	Y
Gen. 9:18		Gen. 9:18			Gen. 9:18	Y
Gen. 11:1		Gen. 11:1			Gen. 11:1	Y
<b>Gen. 12:1</b>		<b>Gen. 12:1</b>			<b>Gen. 12:1</b>	Y
Gen. 14:1		Gen. 14:1			Gen. 14:1	Y
Gen. 15:1		Gen. 15:1			Gen. 15:1	Y
Gen. 16:1		Gen. 16:1			Gen. 16:1	Y
Gen. 17:1		Gen. 17:1			Gen. 17:1	
<b>Gen. 18:1</b>		<b>Gen. 18:1</b>			<b>Gen. 18:1</b>	
Gen. 19:1		Gen. 19:1			Gen. 19:1	Y
Gen. 20:1		Gen. 20:1			Gen. 20:1	
Gen. 21:1		Gen. 21:1			Gen. 21:1	
Gen. 22:1		Gen. 22:1				
Gen. 24:1		Gen. 24:1			[text missing]	
		Gen. 24:42			[text missing]	
		Gen. 25:1			Gen. 25:1	
		<b>Gen. 25:19</b>			<b>Gen. 25:19</b>	
		Gen. 26:12				
		Gen. 27:1				
	Gen. 27:28	Gen. 27:28			[text missing]	
	<b>Gen. 28:10</b>	<b>Gen. 28:10</b>			<b>Gen. 28:10</b>	
	Gen. 29:31	[scribal err]			Gen. 29:31	Y
	Gen. 30:22	Gen. 30:22			[text missing]	Y
	Gen. 31:3	Gen. 31:3			Gen. 31:3	Y
	<b>Gen. 32:4</b>	<b>Gen. 32:4</b>			<b>Gen. 32:4</b>	Y
	Gen. 33:18	Gen. 33:18				Y
	Gen. 35:9	Gen. 35:9				Y
	<b>Gen. 37:1</b>	<b>Gen. 37:1</b>				Y
	Gen. 38:1	Gen. 38:1		Gen. 38:1		Y
	Gen. 39:1	Gen. 39:1		Gen. 39:1	Gen. 39:1	Y
	<b>Gen.41:1</b>	<b>Gen. 41:1</b>		<b>Gen. 41:1</b>	<b>Gen. 41:1</b>	
	Gen. 41:38	Gen. 41:38		Gen. 41:38	Gen. 41:38	
	Gen. 42:18	Gen. 42:18		Gen. 42:18	[text missing]	
	Gen. 43:14	Gen. 43:14		Gen. 43:14	Gen. 43:14	
	<b>Gen. 44:18</b>	<b>Gen. 44:18</b>			[text missing]	Y
	Gen. 46:28	Gen. 46:28			Gen. 46:28	
		Gen. 48:1			Gen. 48:1	Y
		Gen. 49:1			Gen. 49:1	Y
		<u>Gen. 49:27</u>			<u>Gen. 49:27</u> <sup>71</sup>	

27.3.14; T-S NS 45.30, 55.2, 80.9, 80.50, 106.1a, 145.82, 154.87, 172.169, 197.76, 218.6; JTS MS: L222 Fol. 1, L241 Folios 2 & 4-7, L245 Fol. 6-8; Bod. MS HEB: d37/19.A (2603) Fol. 57a-62b, b2/7 (2606) Fol. 12a-13b, d49/18 (2615) Fol. 45a-45b, d 63/36 (2826) Fol. 74a-b, e43/36-37 (2610), e 75/27 (2828) Fol. 59a-60b, e 77/14 (2851) Fol. 22a-27b.

<sup>71</sup> Listed in T-S B17.38 and T-S B17.39, but **not** listed as a *seder* in T-S B17.22.

Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup>	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup>	JTS L245 <sup>69</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>70</sup>	Y
		<b>Ex. 1:1</b>	<b>Ex. 1:1</b>	<b>Ex. 1:1</b>	<b>Ex. 1:1</b>	
		Ex. 3:1	Ex. 3:1	Ex. 3:1	Ex. 3:1	Y
		Ex. 4:18	Ex. 4:18	Ex. 4:18	Ex. 4:18	Y
		<b>Ex. 6:2</b>	<b>Ex. 6:2</b>	<b>Ex. 6:2</b>	<b>Ex. 6:2</b>	
		<u>Ex. 7:8</u>	<u>Ex. 7:8</u>	<u>Ex. 7:8</u>	[no break] <sup>72</sup>	Y
		Ex. 8:16	Ex. 8:16	Ex. 8:16	Ex. 8:16	Y
		<b>Ex. 10:1</b>	<b>Ex. 10:1</b>	<b>Ex. 10:1</b>	<b>Ex. 10:1</b>	Y
		Ex. 11:1	Ex. 11:1	Ex. 11:1	[text missing]	
		Ex. 12:29	Ex. 12:29		Ex. 12:29	Y
		Ex. 13:1	Ex. 13:1		Ex. 13:1	Y
		Ex. 14:15	Ex. 14:15		Ex. 14:15	
		[no break]	[no break]		<u>Ex. 16:4</u> <sup>73</sup>	
		Ex. 16:28	Ex. 16:28		Ex. 16:28	
		<b>Ex. 18:1</b>			<b>Ex. 18:1</b>	
		Ex. 19:6			Ex. 19:6	Y
		<b>Ex. 21:1</b>			<b>Ex. 21:1</b>	Y
		Ex. 22:24			[text missing]	
		<b>Ex. 25:1</b>			[text missing]	
		Ex. 26:1	Ex. 26:1		[text missing]	Y
		Ex. 26:31	Ex. 26:31		Ex. 26:31	Y
		<b>Ex. 27:20</b>	<b>Ex. 27:20</b>		<b>Ex. 27:20</b>	
		Ex. 29:1	Ex. 29:1		Ex. 29:1	
		Ex. 30:1	Ex. 30:1		[text missing]	
		Ex. 31:1			Ex. 31:1	<b>18</b>
		Ex. 32:15			Ex. 32:15	Y
		Ex. 34:27			Ex. 34:27	
		Ex. 37:1			Ex. 37:1	
		<b>Ex. 38:21</b>			[text missing]	
		Ex. 39:33			[text missing]	
		<b>Lev. 1:1</b>			<b>Lev. 1:1</b>	Y
		Lev. 4:1			Lev. 4:1	Y
		Lev. 5:1			Lev. 5:1	
		Lev. 6:12			Lev. 6:12	Y
					Lev. 8:1	Y
					<b>Lev. 9:1</b>	
					Lev. 10:8	
					Lev. 11:1	
					[text missing]	
					[text missing]	
					<b>Lev. 14:1</b>	Y
					Lev. 14:33	Y
					Lev. 15:1	Y
					Lev. 15:25	
					Lev. 17:1	
					Lev. 18:1	
					<b>Lev. 19:1</b>	Y
					Lev. 19:23	Y
					<b>Lev. 21:1</b>	Y
					[text missing]	

<sup>72</sup> T-S B17.13 has the previous and next *s'darim*, but does not include this one.

<sup>73</sup> Listed in T-S B12.31, but **not** listed as a *seder* in T-S B17.30.

Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup>	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup>	JTS L245 <sup>69</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>70</sup>	Y
					Lev. 23:9	
					Lev. 25:14	Y
					[text missing]	
					<b>Lev. 26:3</b>	<b>Y</b>
					Lev. 27:1	
				<b>Num. 1:1</b>	<b>Num. 1:1</b>	<b>Y</b>
				Num. 2:1	[text missing]	
				[text missing]	Num. 3:1	Y
				Num. 4:17	[text missing]	Y
				Num. 5:11	Num. 5:11	Y
				Num. 6:22	[text missing]	Y
				Num. 7:48	[text missing]	
				[text missing]	<b>Num. 8:1</b>	<b>Y</b>
				[text missing]	Num. 10:1	Y
				Num. 11:16		
				Num. 11:23	[text missing]	
				<b>Num. 13:1</b>	[text missing]	<b>Y</b>
					Num. 14:11	Y
			Num. 15:1		Num. 15:1	Y
			<b>Num. 16:1</b>		<b>Num. 16:1</b>	<b>Y</b>
			Num. 17:16		Num. 17:16	Y
			Num. 18:25		Num. 18:25	
			Num. 20:14		[text missing]	Y
			<b>Num. 22:2</b>		[text missing]	<b>Y</b>
			Num. 23:10		Num. 23:10	Y
			Num. 25:1		Num. 25:1	
			[text missing]		<b>Num. 25:10</b>	<b>Y</b>
			Num. 26:52		[text missing]	Y
			Num. 27:15		[text missing]	
			Num. 28:26		Num. 28:26	Y
			<b>Num. 30:2</b>		<b>Num. 30:2</b>	
			Num. 31:1		Num. 31:1	
			[no break]		<u>Num. 31:25</u>	
			Num. 32:1		Num. 32:1	
			<b>Num. 33:1</b>		<b>Num. 33:1</b>	<b>Y</b>
			Num. 34:1		Num. 34:1	
			[text missing]		Num. 35:9	
			<b>Deut. 1:1</b>		<b>Deut. 1:1</b>	
					Deut. 2:2	Y
					Deut. 2:31	Y
					<b>Deut. 3:23</b>	
					Deut. 4:41	
					Deut. 6:4	<b>Y</b>
					<b>Deut. 7:12</b>	<b>Y</b>
					[text missing]	
					Deut. 10:1	Y
					[text missing]	
					Deut. 12:20	
					[text missing]	
					Deut. 15:7	Y
					<b>Deut. 16:18</b>	
					Deut. 17:14	Y
					Deut. 20:10	
					Deut. 22:6	Y

Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup>	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup>	JTS L245 <sup>69</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>70</sup>	Y
					Deut. 23:10	
					Deut. 23:32	
					Deut. 24:19	Y
					<b>Deut. 26:1</b>	
					Deut. 28:1	Y
					<b>Deut. 29:9</b>	Y
					[text missing]	
					Deut. 31:14	Y
					<b>Deut. 32:1</b>	Y
					<b>Deut. 33:1</b>	Y

Comparing these *seder* breaks with those of Yannai's *k'rovot* allows us to gain some insight into the amount of variation in *seder* break locations over time and location. The last column in the table above indicates the Yannai *seder* breaks. Where they match exactly, a "Y" is indicated, and where they are in the same chapter, but a different verse, the verse is indicated. Remarkably, there is only one Yannai *seder* (ex. 31:18) that conflicts with the *g'nizah* fragments, once again suggesting that the *seder* breaks were relatively fixed from Yannai's time onwards.

On the whole, the *g'nizah* fragments identify 158 different *s'darim*. For the most part, the documents all match well as to the location of the breaks. Since the information comes from many different sources, there is no way of telling how many *s'darim* were actually in use in a cycle in any given place or which ones. There are a few variations, however, that have been underlined in the table: *s'darim* at Genesis 49:27 and Exodus 7:8 are found in three sources, but skipped in a fourth source. Exactly the opposite is found with Exodus 16:4 which is found in one source and skipped in three. Numbers 31:25 has one source indicating a break and one indicating no break. In each case, there is only one source which disagrees, and that is insufficient to draw conclusions, as scribal errors in these documents are fairly common. In general the sources we have are very consistent, suggesting a fair amount of uniformity of practice, at least in the times and places for which documents ended up in the Cairo Genizah.

The pattern we saw of *seder* breaks and Annual Cycle *parashah* breaks matching up (more often than not) also becomes clearer with the additional data. Where the breaks coincide, they have been bolded in the table above. It is also worth noting that, as implied by Massekhet



Sof'rim, there are a few *s'darim* shorter than 21 verses that were apparently in use, one with as few as seven verses (Numbers 11:6).

The *g'nizah* fragments also provide our only information on many of the *haftarot* associated with these *s'darim*, as the record from the *piyyutim* is very incomplete. Many of the documents also provide information as to content beyond the first verse as well, some giving us the ending verse and information on skipping. This helps us get a better picture about the lengths of *haftarot* used in the Sequential Triennial Cycle. The following table indicates *haftarot* from the more complete documents, as well as a summary of the less-complete ones.

**Table 4: The *Haftarot* in the *G'nizah* Fragments**

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
Gen. 1:1					<u>Is. 65:17-25</u> <u>Is. 65:17-22-?-66:1</u> <u>Is. 65:17-20-?</u>
Gen 2:4	Is. 51:?:-51:16				Is. 51:6-? Is. 51:?:-8-11, 51:15-16 Is. 51:6-8-?-11-15-?
Gen. 3:22	Ez. 28:13-18, 25				Ez. 28:13-19, 25 Ez. 28:?:-14-18-?-24
Gen. 5:1	Is. 29 ?-19-24, 30:18		Is. ? until 30:15 <sup>75</sup>		Is. 29:18-23-? Is. 29:18-23-?-30:18 Is. ?-29:23-24, 30:18
Gen. 6:9	<b><u>Is. 54:9 until 55:5</u></b>		<b><u>Is. 54:9 until 54:11</u></b>		<b><u>Is. 54:9-15-?</u></b> <b><u>Is. 54:9-17-?-55:5</u></b>
Gen. 8:1	Hab. 3:2 until 3:19		Hab. 3:2 until 3:5		Hab. ?-3:10-19 Hab. ?-3:9-13, 3:18-19 Hab. ?-3:17-19 Hab. 3:2-9-?
Gen. 8:15	Is. 42:7 until 15, 21		Is. 42:7 until 42:21		Is. 42:7-15, 42:21 Is. 42:7-9-?-12-15-? Is. 42:7-11-?

<sup>74</sup> See list in footnote 67, and additionally T-S A 40.12, T-S AS 1.140, T-s AS 11.318, T-S AS 17.182, T-S AS 64.149, T-S AS 68.122, T-S AS 71.253, T-S B17.31, T-S J2.80, T-S K 26.32, T-S NS 286.119, Yevr. III B 402, Yevr. III B 407 (I was not able to view the last two, so data is secondhand, based on the NLI Aleph Catalog and these are placed in parentheses in the table).

<sup>75</sup> This list uses “until” and does not seem to show any skips. It is unclear whether this because it represents a tradition where skipping was not practiced, or whether skips were simply omitted (which would not be an entirely useful reference).

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
Gen. 9:18	Isaiah 49:9-23		Is. 49:9 until 49:14		Is. 49:9-23 (x2)
Gen. 11:1	<i>Zeph. 3:9-17, 20</i>		<i>Zeph. 3:9 until 19</i>		<i>Zeph. 3:9-17, 20</i> <i>Zeph. 3:9-15-?-20</i>
Gen. 12:1	<u><i>Josh. 24:3-10, 14</i></u>		<u><i>Josh. 24:3 until 14</i></u>		<u><i>Josh. 24:3-10, 14</i></u> <u><i>Josh. 24:3-6-?</i></u> <u><i>Josh. ?-24:6-10, 14</i></u>
Gen. 14:1	Is. 41:2-13		Is. 41:2 until 14		Is. 41:2-13
Gen. 15:1	<i>Is. 1:1-8, 2:2-3</i>		<i>Is. 1:1 until 1:17</i>		<i>Is. 1:1-4-?</i> <i>Is. ?-40:21, 40:31</i>
Gen. 16:1	<i>Is. 54:1-10</i>		<i>Is. 54:1 until 9</i>		<i>Is. 54:1-10</i>
Gen. 17:1	Jer. 33:23-34:5, 12-13		Is. 54:10 until 11 <sup>76</sup>		Jer. 33:23-34:5, 34:12-13 Jer. ?-34:3-5 Jer. 33:25-34:8
Gen. 18:1	<u><i>Is. 33:17-24, 35:10</i></u>		<u><i>Is. 33:17 until 34:8</i></u>		<u><i>Is. 33:17-24, 35:10</i></u> <u><i>Is. 33:?-22-24, 35:10</i></u> <u><i>Is. 33:17-20-?</i></u> <u><i>Is. 33:17-22</i></u>
Gen. 19:1	Is. 17:14-18:7, 19:25		Is. 17:14 until 18:7		Is. 17:14-18:6-? Is. 17:14-18:4-? Jud. 19:16-23? or 24?, 20:27
Gen. 20:1	Is. 61:9-62:5, 62:8-9		Is. 61:9 until 10 <sup>77</sup>		Isaiah 61:9-62:5
Gen. 21:1	I Sam. 2:21-28		I Sam. 2:21 until 28		I Samuel 2:21-22-?
Gen. 22:1	Is. 33:7-16, 22		Is. 33:7 until 22		
Gen. 24:1	<u><i>Is. 51:2-11-?</i></u>		<u><i>Is. 51:1 until 11</i></u>		<u><i>Is. ?-51:10-11-?</i></u> <u><i>Is. ?-51:9-11-?</i></u>
Gen. 24:42			Is. 12:3 until 14:2		Is. ?-13:3-4-? Is. ?-12:6-13:4, 14:32
Gen. 25:1			II Sam. 5:13 unt. 6:1		II Sam. ?-5:17-19-? 6:1-2-? II Sam. ?-5:20-21, 6:1- 2-? II Sam. 5:13-21, 6:1-2
Gen. 25:19			<u><i>Is. 65:23 until 66:8</i></u>		<u><i>Is. 65:23-? (x2)</i></u>
Gen. 26:12			Is. 62:8 until 63:7		
Gen. 27:1		Is. 46:?-6-10, 47:4	Is. 46:3 until 47:4		
Gen. 27:28		Mic. 5:7-13, 6:8	Mic. 5:6 until 6:8		Micah ?-6:2, 6:8
Gen. 28:10		<b><u><i>Hos. 12:13-13:4, 14:10</i></u></b>	<b><u><i>Hos. 12:13 until</i></u></b> <sup>78</sup>		<b><u><i>Hos. 12:13-13:4, 14:2-3</i></u></b>
Gen. 29:31		<i>Is. 60:15-20, 61:9</i>	until <i>Is. 61:3</i> <sup>78</sup>		<i>Is. 60:15-16-?</i>
Gen. 30:22		I Sam. 1:11-17, 2:10	I Sam. 1:11 unt. 22		I Sam. 1:?-15-20
Gen. 31:3		<i>Jer. 30:10-16,</i>	Mic. 6:3 until 7:20		<i>Jer. 30:10-18</i>

<sup>76</sup> This entry has words “פסוקין פקט”, perhaps noting the shortness or perhaps indicating to add a well-known section (see Mann, I, 125, 161, 422-423).

<sup>77</sup> This entry has words “פסוקין פקט וגם מן אשלמ' דשוש”, probably indicating to add a well-known section (see Mann, I, 161).

<sup>78</sup> These entries are corrupt due to a scribal error where the start point for one *haftarah* and the end point for the next were combined.

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
		31:12			Jer. ?-30:13-17-? Jer. ?-30:15-18
Gen. 32:4	<b><u>Ob. 1:1-7, 1:21</u></b>	<b><u>Ob. 1:1 until 21</u></b>	<b><u>? -Ob. 1:21</u></b>		<b><u>Ob. 1:1-7-?</u></b> <b><u>Ob. 1:1-5-?</u></b> <b><u>Ob. 1:1-11, 21</u></b>
Gen. 33:18	<i>Nah. 1:12-2:5; Hab. 2:3</i>	<i>Nah.1:12</i> unt. 1:7 <sup>79</sup>	<i>Nah. 1:12</i> unt. 2:1		
Gen. 35:9	<i>Is. 43:1-7, 44:5</i>	<i>Is. 43:1</i> until 21	<i>Is. 43:1</i> until 7		
Gen. 37:1	<u><i>Is. 32:18 -33:6, 33:22</i></u>	<u><i>Is. 32:18</i> until 33:15</u>	<u><i>Is. 32:18</i> unt. 33:2</u>		
Gen. 38:1	<i>Is. 37:31-37, 38:22</i>	<i>Is. 37:31</i> until 38:6	<i>Is. 37:31</i> unt. 35		
Gen. 39:1	<i>Is. 52:3-10, 54:13</i>	<i>Is. 52:3</i> until 53:5	<i>Is. 52:3</i> until 7		<i>Is. ?-52:7-10</i> <i>Is. ?-53:4-5</i>
Gen. 41:1	<u><i>Is. 29:8-14, 29:23</i></u>	<u><i>Is. 29:8</i> until 19</u>	<u><i>Is. 29:8</i> until 19</u>		<u><i>Is. 29:8-14, 29:18-19</i></u> <u><i>Is. 29:8-10-?-15-17-?</i></u>
Gen. 41:38	<i>Is. 11:2-9, 12:6</i>	<i>Is. 11:2</i> until 11:16	<i>Is. 11:2</i> until 5		<i>Is. 11:1-11-?</i> <i>Is. 11:?-11-12-?</i>
Gen. 42:18	<i>Is. 50:10-51:5, 52:7</i>	<i>Is. 50:10</i> unt 51:11	<i>Is. 50:10</i> unt. 51:3		<i>Is. 50:?-51:1-6</i> <i>Is. ?-51:1-2-?-6-?</i> <i>Is. ?-50:11-51:2-?-4-8-?</i>
Gen. 43:14	<i>Jer.42:[10-]12-17, 43:12</i>	<i>Jer. 42:12</i> until 20	<i>Jer. 42:10</i> unt. 12		<i>Jer. 42:12-16-?</i> <i>Jer. ?-42:16-17-?</i> <i>Is. 49:[14?]-?-15-20, 26-?</i>
Gen. 44:18	<i>Josh. 14:6-13, 17:14</i>	<u><i>Josh. 14:6</i> until 15</u>	<u><i>Josh. 14:6</i> until 9</u>		<u><i>Josh. 14:?-9-13</i></u>
Gen. 46:28	<i>Zech. 10:6-11-??</i>	<i>Zech. 10:6</i> unt. 11:7			<i>Zech. 10:6-12</i>
Gen. 48:1		<u><i>II Kin. 13:14</i> unt. 23</u>	<u><i>II Kin. 13:14</i> unt. 17</u>		<u><i>II Kin. 13:14-20, 23</i></u> <u><i>II Kin. 13:14-23</i></u>
Gen. 49:1	<i>Is. ?-43:25</i>	<i>Is. 43:22</i> until 44:6	<i>Is. 43:22</i> until 25		<i>Is. 43:22-44:1, 44:5</i> <i>Is. 43:22-44:6</i>
Gen. 49:27	<i>Zech. 14:1-5</i>	<i>Zech. 14:1</i> until 11	<i>Zech. 14:1</i> until 5		<i>Zech. 14:1-11</i>
Ex. 1:1	<b><u>Is. 27:6 until 28:5</u></b>	<b><u>Is. 27:6-?</u></b>	<b><u>Is. 27:6 until 28:5</u></b>	<b><u>Is. 27:6 until 12</u></b>	<b><u>Is. 27:6-13 x2</u></b> <b><u>Is. 27:6-28:1-?</u></b>
Ex. 3:1	<i>Is. ?</i> until 40:22		<i>Is. 40:11</i> until 31	<i>Is. 40:11</i> until 13	<i>Is. 40:11-19, 31</i> <i>Is. ?-40:12-20-?</i>
Ex. 4:18	<i>Is. ?</i> until 56:8		<i>Is. 55:12</i> until 56:7	<i>Is. 55:12</i> unt. 56:1	<i>Is. 55:12-?</i> <i>Is. ?-56:1-6-?</i> <i>Ez. 16:[6?]-13-14</i>
Ex. 6:2	<u><i>Is. 42:8</i> until 21</u>	<u><i>Is. ?-42:9-11-?</i></u>	<u><i>Is. 42:8</i> until 21</u>	<u><i>Is. 42:8</i> until 12</u>	<u><i>Is. ?-42:12-15-?</i></u> <b><u>Ez. 28:24-29:12, 28:21</u></b> <b><u>Ez. ?-29:8-9-</u></b>
Ex. 7:8	<i>Joel 3:3</i> until 4:16	<i>Joel ?-4:1</i>	<i>Joel 3:3</i> until 4:1	<i>Joel 3:3</i> until 5	<i>Joel 3:3-4:5, 4:8</i>
Ex. 8:16	<u><i>Is. 34:11</i> until 35:4</u>	<u><i>Is. 34:11-14-?</i></u>	<u><i>Is. 34:11</i> unt. 35:10</u>	<u><i>Is. 34:11</i> unt. 16</u>	<u><i>Is. ?-34:16</i></u> <u><i>Is. 34:11-14-?-35:2</i></u> <i>Is. 19:1-7-?</i> <i>Is. 19:1-?</i>
Ex. 10:1	<i>I Sam. 6:6</i> until 14		<i>I Sam. 6:6</i> until 14	<i>I Sam. 6:6</i> unt. 13	<i>I Sam. 6:6-9-?-12-13-?</i> <i>I Sam. 6:6-12-?</i>
Ex. 11:1	<i>Mic. 7:15</i> unt. <i>Nah. 1:7</i>		(omitted) unt. <i>Nah. 1:9</i>	<i>Hag. 2:6</i> unt. 11? <i>Mic. 7:15</i> until 20	<i>Haggai ?-2:7-14, 23</i> <i>?-Haggai 2:23</i>
Ex. 12:29	<i>Is. 21:11</i> until 22:23		<i>Is. 21:11</i> unt. 22:23		<i>Is. 21:11-22:4, 15 (x2)</i>
Ex. 13:1	<i>Is. 46:3</i> until 13		<i>Is. 46:3</i> until 46:4 <sup>76</sup>		<i>Is. 46:3-6-?</i> <i>Is. 46:?-4-6-?</i>

<sup>79</sup> This entry appears to have a scribal error indicating an earlier verse as the ending point.

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
Ex. 14:15	Is. 65:24 until 66:10		Is. 65:24 unt. 66:10		Is. 46:3 unt. "דסופה דאפ" Is. 65:24-66:1 Is. 65:24 until 66:5, 66:6-9 +??
Ex. 16:4					Is. 49:?-11-23 Is. 49:10-?22?
Ex. 16:28	Is. 58:13 until 59:20	Is.?-58:14-59:1	Is. 58:13 unt. 59:21		Is. 58:13-59:6, 20-21 Is. 58:13-? Is. 58:13-59:2-? Is. ?-59:20-21
Ex. 18:1	<u>Is. 33:13 until 22</u>	<u>Is. 33:13-15-?</u>	<u>Is. 33:13 until 22</u>		<u>Is. ?-33:16-22</u> <u>Is. 33:13-16-?</u>
Ex. 19:6	Is. 61:6 until 62:4	Is. 61:6-7-?	Is. 61:6 until 10		Is. 61:6-62:1-? Is. ?-62:1-2, 62:5 Is. 61:6-62:2-?
Ex. 21:1	<u>Is. 56:1 until 57:19</u>		<u>Is. 56:1 unt. (omitted)</u>		<u>Is. 56:1-2-?</u> <u>Is. ?-56:3-7-?</u>
Ex. 22:24	Is. 48:10 until 20		(omitted) unt. Is. 49:3		Is. ?-48:13-16, 49:13
Ex. 25:1	<u>Is. 60:17 until 61:6</u>	<u>Is. ?-60:18-20-?</u>	<u>Is. 60:17 until 61:9</u>		<u>Is. ?-60:19-22, 61:9-?</u>
Ex. 26:1	<u>Is. 66:1 until 11</u>	<u>Is. 66:1-8-?</u>	<u>Is. 66:1 until 11</u>		Is. ?-66:8-11
Ex. 26:31	<u>Ez. 16:10 until 60</u>	<u>Ez. 16:10-12-?</u>	<u>Ez. 16:10 until 19<sup>80</sup></u>		<u>Ez. 16:10-19-?</u>
Ex. 27:20	Hos. 14:7 unt. Joel 2:14	Hos. ?-14:10-?	Hos. 14:7 until Joel 1:14		<u>Jer. 11:16-12:2, 15:15-16</u> <u>Jer. ?-12:1-2, 15:15-16</u>
Ex. 29:1	Is. 61:6 until 62:5		Is. 61:6 until (omitted)		Is. 61:6-62:5-? (x2)
Ex. 30:1	Mal. 1:11 until 2:7	Mal. 1:11-?-2:1	Mal. 1:11 until 2:7		Mal. ?-2:5-7 Mal.?-1:12-2:1, 2:17 Mal.?-1:14-2:7 Mal.?-1:11-2:2-?-2:5-7
Ex. 31:1		<u>Is. 43:7, 40:14-?<sup>81</sup></u>	<u>Is. 43:7 until 21</u>		<u>Is. 43:7-15</u> <u>Is. 43:7-9-?-12-15 (x2)</u> <u>Is. 43:7-10-?</u> <u>Is. ?-43:12-15</u>
Ex. 32:15		II Sam. ?-22:13-19-?	II Sam. 22:10 until 51		II Sam. 22:10-33 II Sam. 22:10-?-15-22-? II Sam. 22:10-13-?
Ex. 34:27		<u>Jer. 31:32-33-?</u>	<u>Jer. 31:32 until 39</u>		<u>Jer. 31:32-?</u> <u>Jer. ?-31:33-34-?</u> <u>?-Jer. 31:39</u>
Ex. 37:1		<u>I Kin. ?-8:8-9-?</u>	<u>I Kin. 8:8 until 22</u>		<u>I Kin. 8:8-12-?</u>
Ex. 38:21		<u>Jer. ?-30:20-21-?</u>	<u>Jer. 30:18 until 31:8</u>		<u>Jer. ?-31:6-7-?</u> <u>Jer. 30:18-23-?</u>
Ex. 39:33			Is. 33:20 until 34:8		Is. 33:20-21-?-34:2-4, 17 Is. ?-34:6-8 Is. ?-34:1-5, 35:1-2 Is. ?-33:22-24-?-35:10
Lev. 1:1		<u>Mic. 6:9-10-?-7:5-7-?</u>	<u>Mic. 6:9 until Is. 14:29<sup>82</sup></u>		<u>Mic. 6:9-10-?-14-7:2-?-7-8-?</u>

<sup>80</sup> Written in margin.

<sup>81</sup> Probably a scribal error.

<sup>82</sup> Probably a scribal error and Micah 7:8 was intended.

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
					Is. ?-48:20-49:3 Is. ?-48:20-49:1-? Is. 48:15-49:3 I Sam. 3:4-7-?
Lev. 4:1		Ez. ?-18:7-9	Ez. 18:4 until 17		Ez. 18:4-13, 18:16-17 (x2) Ez. 18:4-17 Ez. ?-18:6-12, 24-? Ez. ?-18:10, 32 Ez. ?-18:10-11-?-16-17
Lev. 5:1		Zech. 5:3-?-5:5	Zech. 5:3 until 6:14		Zech. 5:3-11, 6:11-12 Zech. 5:3-8-? Zech. 5:3-9-? Zech. 5:3-8, 6:15 Zech. 5:3-4-?-7-10 Zech. 5:3-11-?
Lev. 6:12		<u>Mal. 3:4-6-?</u>	<u>Mal. 3:4 until ?</u>		<u>Mal. ?-3:9-11</u> <u>Mal. 3:4-9, 23</u>
Lev. 8:1		I Sam. ?-2:29-30-?			I Sam. 2:28-33-? I Sam. 2:28-31, 2:35, 3:20 I Sam. ?-2:34-35-?
Lev. 9:1					<u>Ez. ?-44:6-8, 44:30</u> <u>Ez. 43:27-44:5, 44:30</u>
Lev. 10:8		Ez. ?-44:25-?			Ez. 44:21-28-? Ez. ?-44:25-? Ez. 44:21-27, 46:3
Lev. 11:1		Is. ?-40:19-21-?			Is. 40:16-21-?
[Lev. 12:1]		<u>Is. [66:7]-?-66:9-11</u>			
[Lev. 13:29]		Is. 7:20-?-22-23-8:1-?			Is. ?-7:23-8:4-? Is. ?, 9:6 Is. ?-7:21-8:5
Lev. 14:1		Is. 57:17-19-?			Is. 57:17-21-? Is. 57:17-58:8
Lev. 14:33					Is. 5:8-15-? Is. ?-5:10-16 Is. 5:8-14-?
Lev. 15:1					<u>Hos. 6:1-9-?</u> Hos. ?-6:2-7:2-? Hos. ?-6:2-6:11, 10:12
Lev. 15:25					<u>Ez. 16:9-?</u> Is. [4.4]-?-4:5-5:7, 16
Lev. 17:1		Is. ?-66:3-4-?			Is. ?-66:7-9 Is. 66:3-8-?-11-13 Is. ?-66:11
Lev. 18:1		Is. [40:17]-?-40:20-22			Jer. 10:2-10 x2 Jer. 10:2-3-?
Lev. 19:1		<u>Is. 4:3-6-?</u>			<u>Is. 4:3-5:7, 5:16</u> <u>Is. 4:3-5-?</u>
Lev. 19:23		Is. 65:22-23-?			Is. 65:22-23-? Is. ?-65:23-66:2, 5-7, 10-11
Lev. 21:1		<u>Ez. 44:25-27-?</u>			<u>Ez. 44:25-27-?</u>
[Lev. 22:17]		Is. 56:7-?			Is. 56:7-57:4, 57:19
Lev. 23:9		Joel ?-4:17-?			Joel 4:13-21
Lev. 25:14		<u>Is. ?-24:7-11-?</u>			<u>Is. 24:2-11-?</u>

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
					<u>Is. ?-24:7-11-?</u> <u>Is. ?-24:7-12-?</u>
[Lev. 25:35]		<i>Is. 35:3-7-?</i>			<i>Is. 35:3-10 (x2)</i> <i>Is. 35:?-5-8-?</i>
Lev. 26:3		<u><i>Is. 1:19-26-?</i></u>			<u><i>Is. 1:19-27, 2:2-3</i></u> <u><i>Is. 1:19-?-24-28-?</i></u> <u><i>Is. 1:?-21-25-?-30-2:1, 5</i></u>
Lev. 27:1		Jud. ?-11:32-?		Jud. ?-11:40	<i>Jud. 11:30-40</i> <i>Jud. 11:?-30-33-?-36, 40</i> <i>Jud. 11:30-?-34-36-?</i>
Num. 1:1		Is. 35:1-?		<u><i>Hos. 2:16-22</i></u>	<u><i>Hos. 2:16-17-?</i></u> <u><i>Hos. 2:16-?-23, 25-?</i></u> <u><i>Hos. ?-2:17-20-?</i></u>
Num. 2:1				Is. 49:6-8-?	
Num. 3:1		<i>Is. 45:19-20-?</i>		Is. ?-46:1-2, 13	
Num. 4:17		Is. 48:9-14-?		Is. 48:9-19	<i>Is. 48:?-13-19</i> <i>Is. ?-49:6-7-?</i>
Num. 5:11				<u><i>Hos. 4:14-5:4, 6:2</i></u>	<u><i>Hos. 4:14-?</i></u>
Num. 6:22				<i>Is. 44:3-11, 23</i>	<i>Is. ?-44:6</i>
Num. 7:48				Jer. 31:19-23-?	<i>Jer. ?-31:20-23-?,33</i> <i>Jer. ?-31:22</i>
Num. 8:1					<u><i>Zech. 4:2-10-?, 6:12</i></u> <u><i>? Zech. 4:2-?</i></u> <u><i>Zech. ?-3:7-9-?</i></u>
Num. 10:1				Is. ?-28:6-8, 29:19	<i>Is. 27:13-28:2-?</i>
Num. 11:16				<i>Is. 24:23-25:8</i>	
Num. 11:23				Is. 59:1-10, 20-21	<i>Is. ?-59:1-2-?</i> <i>Is. ?-59:5-6, 16</i>
Num. 13:1				<u><i>Josh. 2:1-9-?</i></u>	<u><i>Josh. ?-2:8-11</i></u> <u><i>Josh. ?-2:1-2-?</i></u> <u><i>Josh. ?-2:1-?-2:4-5-?</i></u> <u><i>Josh. 2:1-4-?-11-16-?</i></u>
Num. 14:11			Is. 52:5-?		<i>Is. 52:5-6-?</i> <i>Is. ?-52:12</i> <i>Is. ?-53:3</i> <i>Is. ?, 52:6-7</i> <i>Is. 52:5-?</i>
Num. 15:1			Is. 56:3-?		<i>Is. 56:7-57:5, 19 (x2)</i> <i>Is. 56:3-5-?</i> <i>? Is. 56:6-?</i>
Num. 16:1			<u><i>Hos. 10:2-?</i></u>		<u><i>Hos. 10:2-12</i></u> <u><i>Hos. ?-10:6-9-?</i></u> <u><i>Hos. ?-10:8-12-?</i></u> <u><i>Hos. ?-10:4-?</i></u> <u><i>Hos. 10:2-3-?</i></u>
Num. 17:16			<i>Is. 11:1-?</i>		<i>Is. 11:1-6-?</i> <i>Is. 11:?-8-11-?</i> <i>Is. 11:?-3-4-?</i> <i>Is. 11:?-9-12</i> <i>Is. 11:?-9-11-?</i>
Num. 18:25			<i>Is. 62:8-?</i>		<i>Is. 62:8-10-?</i> <i>Is. ?-63:7-9</i> <i>Is. 62:8-9-?</i>

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
Num. 20:14			<i>Obad. 1:1-?</i>		Is.?-62:9-10-?-63:3-5-? <i>Obad. 1:1-8, 21</i> <i>Obad. ?-1:3-6-?</i>
Num. 22:2			<i>Mic. 7:16-?</i>		<i>Mic. ?-7:17-18-?</i> <i>Mic. ?-7:20</i>
Num. 23:10			<i>Is. 49:23-?</i>		<i>Is. 49:23-25-?</i> <i>Is. ?-50:4-6, 51:3</i> <i>(Is. ?-49:25-26-?)</i>
Num. 25:1			Joel 4:18-?		Joel 4:18-21-Amos 1:1-5, 3:7 (Joel 4:18-21-Amos 1:1-2)
Num. 25:10			<u><i>Mal. 2:5-?</i></u>		<u><i>Mal. 2:5-6-?</i></u> <u><i>Mal. ?-3:6-10-?</i></u> <u><i>(Mal. 2:5-12)</i></u>
Num. 26:52			<i>Is. 57:13-?</i>		<i>Is. 57:13-19, 58:14</i> <i>Is. ?-57:16-19-?</i> <i>(Is. 57:13-18)</i>
Num. 27:15			Is. 40:13-?		Is. ?-40:21-26, 40:31 Is. 40:13-19, 40:31 Is. ?-40:17-21-?-25-26, 31 (Is. 40:13-20)
Num. 28:26			Mal. 3:4-?		Mal. 3:4-9-? Mal. ?-3:5-10 (Mal. 3:4-8)
Num. 30:2			Is. 45:23-?		Is. ?-46:7, 46:13 Is. 45:23-46:4, 48:11 (Is. 45:23-46:1-?) Is. 4:12-22, 31
Num. 31:1			Ez. 25:14-?		Ez. 25:14-26:6-? Ez. 25:14-26:3, 27:17 Ez. 25:14-26:2-?
Num. 31:25					Is. 49:24-50:3, 51:11 Is. 49:24-50:2, 51:11
Num. 32:1			Josh. 22:8-?		Josh. 22:8-14, 22:33 Josh. ?-22:9-13-? Josh. 22:8-10-?
Num. 33:1			Is. 11:16-?		Is. 11:16-12:6 Is. 11:16-12:5, 14:2 Is. ?-12:2-? Is. ?-11:17-12:3 +??
Num. 34:1			Ez. 45:1-?		Ez. 45:1-8 Ez. 45:1-4-? Ez. ?-45:4-? Ez. 45:1-8-?
Num. 35:9			<u>Josh. 20:1-</u>		<u>Josh. 20:1-7, 21:1-3</u> <u>Josh. ?-20:5-6-?</u>
Deut. 1:1					Zech. 8:16-23 Zech. 8:16-? Zech. ?-8:19-21, 10:12 Zech. ?-8:19-23 Jer. ?-30:6-9-?
Deut. 2:2					Obad. 1:21, Jon. 1:1-? ?-Jon. ?-1:8-1:9 ?-Jon. 1:3-8-?

	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
					Obad. 1:21, Jon. 1:1-6, 2:10 ?-Jon. 1:5-8-?
Deut. 2:31					Obad. 1:21, Jon. 1:1-5-? Josh. 10:12-16, 18-21-? Josh. 10:12-18, 42 Josh. 10:14-17-?
Deut. 3:23					Is. 33:2, 33:4-10, 22
Deut. 4:41					Josh. ?-21:2-3 Josh. 20:8-21:5, 43
Deut. 6:4					Zech. ?-14:11-? Zech. 14:?-10-13-? Zech. 14:9-15, 21
Deut. 7:12					Is. 54:10-12-? Is. 54:10-15-? Is. ?-54:12-13-?
[Deut. 9:1]					Josh. 1:?-11-17-? Josh. 1:10-17, 3:7 Josh. 1:?-1:15-16, 3:7
Deut. 10:1					I Kin. 8:9-13-? I Kin. 8:9-? I Kin. 8:9-10-?
[Deut 11:10]					Is. [30:23]-30:27-29, 32:18
Deut. 12:20					Is. 54:2-4-?
[Deut. 14:1]					Is. [46:3]-?-46:4-6-? Is. ?-46:6-13
Deut. 15:7					Is. ?-29:19-23-? Is. 29:22-30:5, 30:18 Is. 29:22-?
Deut. 16:18					Is. ?-1:28-2:3 Is. 1:26-2:3
Deut. 17:14					Is. 32:1-? Is. ?-32:6-13, 18 Is. 32:1-5-? (Is. 32:1-20)
Deut. 20:10					Is. ?-66:19-24 Is. 66:12-23 (Is. 66:12-19)
Deut. 22:6					Is. 31:5-32:2, 33:2 Is. ?-31:5-32:1 Is. ?-31:6-7-? Is. 31:5-32:2-?
Deut. 23:10					Is. 1:16-23, 1:26 Is. 1:16-27 Is. ?-1:17-19-?
Deut. 23:32					Is. 19:21-20:2, 22:21 Is. 19:21-21:3-?-22:22-23
Deut. 24:19					Hos. 10:12-11:3, 12:7 Hos. 10:12-11:1-?-11:4
Deut. 26:1					Ez. 44:30-45:5, 46:3 Ez.44:30-45:8-? (Ez. 44:30-45:15)
Deut. 28:1					Is. 55:2-8 Is. 55:2-56:2



	Bod. HEB d64/7 (2822) <sup>66</sup> & JTS L245 <sup>69</sup>	Bod. HEB d 42/6 (2740) <sup>67</sup> & T-S B17.38	Bod. HEB f 21 (2727) <sup>68</sup> & T-S NS 253.7	T-S NS 224.182 & Add 3357	Misc. <sup>74</sup>
Deut. 29:9					(Is. 55:2-56:5) Josh. 24:1-2-? (x2) Josh. 24:1-13-? Josh. 24:1-6, 10 (Is. 60:21-61:9)
[Deut. 30:11]					Is. 48:?-18-49:3, 49:13 Is. ?-49:13 (Is. 48:18-49:5) (Is. 48:18-49:10)
Deut. 31:14					I Kin. 2:1-6, 2:45 I Kin. 2:1-3-? I Kin. 2:1-5-? (I Kin. 2:1-12)
Deut. 32:1					Is. 1:2-8, 2:3 Is. 1:2-8-? (Is. 1:2-19)
Deut. 33:1					<b><u>Josh. 1:1-9</u></b> <b><u>Josh. 1:1-7-?-9</u></b> <b><u>Josh. 1:?-11</u></b>

The pattern that immediately emerges is that the variety of sources for each *seder* nearly always have the same *haftarah* starting point, but the length of the *haftarah*, and the location(s) of any skipping vary quite considerably among the sources. Occasionally we find two or even three totally different *haftarot* for the same *seder*, but on the whole, there is remarkable consistency. This pattern suggests that we are dealing with sources from a variety of times and/or places, rather than several documents from the same locality. It also suggests that the starting verses for the *haftarot* became fixed before the ending points, and, in fact, it is possible that the ending points never were finalized, being left up to each community to develop a tradition, or perhaps even ended differently by different readers on a case-by-case basis.

Another pattern we see is very few *haftarot* that are the full 21 verses as mentioned by the Tannaitic and Amoraic texts. Most of them seem to fall into a seven to eleven verse range, with some as short as three verses. Some sources, such as T-S NS 224.182, seem to tend towards these three verse *haftarot* more than others, suggesting that the standard length for a *haftarah* varied somewhat by locality. In general, the *haftarah* lengths seem to accord more with the various sources that permit shorter *haftarot* when there is a translator or someone expounding upon the text.

*Haftarot* for the Sequential Triennial Cycle also seem often to include skipping, usually at the end of the *haftarah* and to only one or two verses. This generally seems to be intended so as to end the *haftarah* on a positive or significant verse, which may be tied to the Y'rushalmi's discussion of a reader starting and ending on a positive note. As permitted by the earlier sources, we see skipping from one book of the Minor Prophets to the next, but otherwise within the same book, and only skipping relatively short amounts. Occasionally, there are two different skips in a *haftarah* and occasionally skips of only one or two verses, but it is possible that some of these are cases of scribal errors. The frequency of skipping was probably necessitated by the shorter *haftarah* length, as it would often be difficult to start with a verse that has verbal tallying with the *seder*, and still end on a positive note.

With an understanding of the verbal tallying process and the starting verses for the *haftarah*, is it possible to project the starting locations of the eight *s'darim* for which the *g'nizah* texts were missing the *seder* name. These have been indicated in brackets in the above table. Two of these gaps are also covered by the surviving Yannai *piyyutim* and indeed the starting verses match up exactly. Additionally, there are quite a few cases of *g'nizah* fragments that only contain the middle or end of a *haftarah* and are missing the beginnings. In most of these cases, the multiple sources allow us to guess reasonably that these documents also began their *haftarot* in the same place, but in some cases we have no *g'nizah* fragments that show the beginning of the *haftarah*. In these cases, we can also apply our understanding of verbal tallying, as well as the typical range of lengths for a *haftarah* to project where the *haftarah* likely began (also indicated in brackets in the above table).

A comparison to the starting verses for *haftarot* found in Yannai *piyyutim* reveals that every single *haftarah* referenced by Yannai is attested to by at least one *g'nizah* source. (The *haftarah* chart indicates a coincidence of starting verse with italics.) There are, of course, a few *s'darim* which have more than one *haftarah* indicated. The close correlation, however, shows that the starting points for the *haftarot* indeed were fixed relatively early (the early 7<sup>th</sup> century at

the latest) and there was very little variation from that point onwards (and even those may have existed in earlier times in places with a different practice than that of Yannai's community).

When comparing the list to the *haftarot* of the Annual Cycle used in the Ashkenazi and Sephardi rites, however, the outcome is very different. Only ten out of a possible forty-three<sup>83</sup> of the Annual Cycle *haftarot* match at all (bolded in table), and these do not all have the same beginning point. This suggests that the traditions for *haftarot* in the two cycles developed independently, perhaps with some influence upon each other. The need for the Sequential Triennial Cycle *haftarot* to have verbal tallying with the *seder* (and lack of such in the Annual Cycle) suggests that where the *haftarot* of the two cycles coincide, the *haftarah* originated in the Sequential Triennial Cycle.

The Romaniote and Karaite *haftarot* for the Annual Cycle are another matter, however. Out of the same forty-three possibilities, thirty-seven have matches (underlined) between the Sequential Triennial Cycle and either the Romaniote or Karaite *haftarah* (usually both). Interestingly, while the most common case is that when the *parashah* and *seder* start on the same verse, they share a *haftarah*, there are a number of examples where the Annual Cycle *haftarah* actually belongs to the *seder* before or after the shared starting point. In fact, there are even cases where the breaks between the weekly Torah portions in both systems are in different places, but the *haftarot* are still shared. This would seem to indicate that the Romaniote and Karaite *haftarot* were based upon the Sequential Triennial Cycle and not vice-versa, as the verbal tallying only makes sense for the associations of Torah/*haftarah* in the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Many of the Romaniote and Karaite *haftarot* that do not match the Sequential Triennial Cycle match the Ashkenazi and Sephardi *haftarot* of the Annual Cycle, which suggests that those rites had an influence, but of a lesser nature.

---

<sup>83</sup> 54 total *parashiyot* less the eleven that are based on the calendar and not on content, read from 17 Tammuz to Yom Kippur.

Also of significance in the *haftarah* listing, is that the eleven *haftarot* that are tied to the calendar (Haftarot of Rebuke, Consolation, and Shabbat Shuvah) are not represented in the cycle at all as they are in the Annual Cycle. These *haftarot* are known to have been practiced in Eretz Yisrael, as the Midrashic text Pesikta d’Rav Kahana references them and is written in Palestinian Aramaic. Indeed, a list of the special *haftarot* for these weeks can be found in some of the *haftarah* listings from the *g’nizah*, most notably T-S B17.32 and T-S B17.38, *separately* from the listings for the *s’darim*. This strongly implies that the Sequential Triennial Cycle, at least as practiced in the later period and in the vicinity of the Cairo Genizah, was *not* fixed to a three-year calendar. If it were, we would expect either to see the special *haftarot* for these weeks in the regular listing itself, or to see gaps in the listing where there were no “ordinary” *haftarot*. Even if such a theoretical fixed cycle could shift a little bit against the calendar due to different year lengths, the sequence of eleven consecutive weeks would still preempt certain *haftarot* in every single cycle. Thus we have evidence here for either a cycle that was not fixed to the calendar at all, or that lasted three and a half-years such that any *haftarah* could be read at two different times of year. This is consistent with the use of *tal/geshem* in the Yannai *k’rovot*.

The *g’nizah* documents also shed some light on Torah reading practice in these places in times. In general, these are lists of *s’darim* and *haftarot* or full texts of the *haftarot* (sometimes Hebrew, sometimes Aramaic (Targum Yonatan), and sometimes both, verse-by-verse). It seems like the former would have been used for reference, but the latter were probably designed for use in synagogue or at least for preparation for the synagogue reading. This suggests that the institution of the translator into Aramaic may have still been in place in this time. This is consistent with the shorter length of the *haftarot* in keeping with the rules for short *haftarot* that we have seen. Some of the documents include both Annual Cycle *and* Sequential Triennial Cycle information/readings in the same text. Since these appear to be practical texts for synagogue use, this strongly suggests the existence of localities where both cycles were in use.

Beyond the *g’nizah* texts, we also have various Masoretic manuscripts which preserved the locations of the *seder* breaks for the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Among the oldest of these

are what have become known as the Aleppo Codex (c. 930) and the Leningrad Codex (c. 1010). The former is currently missing the vast majority of the section containing the books of the Torah, but provides data on *seder* breaks for the last five *s'darim* that are consistent with all other manuscripts.<sup>84</sup> The Leningrad Codex indicates 167 *seder* breaks in both the body of the text and in the iteration of the breaks in the endnotes; however, the two lists differ with regard to one break.<sup>85</sup> A later manuscript from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, known as the “Damascus Keter” (despite originating in Spain), contains 141 *seder* breaks in the body of the text. It also notes a total of 154 *s'darim* in the endnotes for the Torah section, but iterates 153 *s'darim* prior to the text (though there is one skipped number).<sup>86</sup> The “Bomberg Bible” published in 1524, contains a listing and count of 154 *s'darim* prior to the Biblical text.<sup>87</sup> A number of other manuscripts reportedly contain this same 154 count<sup>88</sup>. A comparison of the *seder* breaks in these major texts compiled from scans of the original texts themselves is found in the table below:

**Table 5: The *Seder* Divisions in the Masoretic Text**

Len. Codex (body)	Len. Codex (end notes)	Bomberg	Dam. Keter (body)	Dam. Keter (notes)	Aleppo Codex	Y	G
1. Gen. 1:1	1. Gen. 1:1	1. Gen. 1:1	1. Gen. 1:1	1. Gen. 1:1			G
2. Gen. 2:4	2. Gen. 2:4	2. Gen. 2:4	2. Gen. 2:4	2. Gen. 2:4			G
3. Gen. 3:22	3. Gen. 3:22	3. Gen. 3:22	3. Gen. 3:22	3. Gen. 3:22			G
4. Gen. 5:1	4. Gen. 5:1	4. Gen. 5:1	4. Gen. 5:1	4. Gen. 5:1			G
5. Gen. 6:9	5. Gen. 6:9	5. Gen. 6:9	5. Gen. 6:9	5. Gen. 6:9			G
<b>6. Gen. 8:1</b>	<b>6. Gen. 8:1</b>			<b>6. Gen. 8:1</b>			<b>G</b>
<b>7. Gen. 8:15</b>	<b>7. Gen. 8:15</b>	<b>6. Gen. 8:15</b>	<b>6. Gen. 8:15</b>			<b>Y</b>	<b>G</b>
8. Gen. 9:18	8. Gen. 9:18	7. Gen. 9:18	7. Gen. 9:18	7. Gen. 9:18		Y	G

<sup>84</sup> Aharon Ben Asher, "Aleppo Codex," N.d. MS., *The Aleppo Codex Online*, Ben-Zvi Institute, 2007, Accessed on 3 Jan. 2015, <<http://www.aleppocodex.org/newsite/index.html>>.

<sup>85</sup> Samuel Ben Jacob, “Leningrad Codex,” N.d. MS, Internet Archive, Accessed on 4 Jan. 2015, <[https://archive.org/details/Leningrad\\_Codex](https://archive.org/details/Leningrad_Codex)>.

<sup>86</sup> Abraham ibn Malek, “*Damascus Keter*”, 1260, MS Heb 790, The National Library of Israel, Burgos, Spain, *Digitized Manuscripts - From the Collection of the National Library and Other Collections*, Accessed on 11 Jan. 2015.

<sup>87</sup> Yaakov ben Hayyim, *The Second Rabbinic Bible (Mikraot Gedolot) Volume 1*, Daniel Bomberg: Venice 1524, Internet Archive, Accessed on 5 Jan. 2015, 11.

<sup>88</sup> Lionel Moses, “Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?” *Proceedings of the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards | 1986-1990*, G & H Soho: Hoboken, 2001, 372-373.

Len. Codex (body)	Len. Codex (end notes)	Bomberg	Dam. Keter (body)	Dam. Keter (notes)	Aleppo Codex	Y	G
<b>9. Gen. 11:1</b>	<b>9. Gen. 11:1</b>					<b>Y</b>	<b>G</b>
10. Gen. 12:1	10. Gen. 12:1	8. Gen. 12:1	8. Gen. 12:1	8. Gen. 12:1		Y	G
		<b>9. Gen. 12:10</b>		<b>9. Gen. 12:10</b>			
11. Gen. 14:1	11. Gen. 14:1	10. Gen. 14:1	9. Gen. 14:1	<b>11. Gen. 14:1</b> <sup>89</sup>		Y	G
12. Gen. 15:1	12. Gen. 15:1	11. Gen. 15:1	10. Gen. 15:1	12. Gen. 15:1		Y	G
13. Gen. 16:1	13. Gen. 16:1	12. Gen. 16:1	11. Gen. 16:1	13. Gen. 16:1		Y	G
14. Gen. 17:1	14. Gen. 17:1	13. Gen. 17:1	12. Gen. 17:1	14. Gen. 17:1			G
<b>15. Gen. 18:1</b>	<b>15. Gen. 18:1</b>	<b>14. Gen. 18:1</b>		<b>15. Gen. 18:1</b>			<b>G</b>
16. Gen. 19:1	16. Gen. 19:1	15. Gen. 19:1	13. Gen. 19:1	16. Gen. 19:1		Y	G
17. Gen. 20:1	17. Gen. 20:1	16. Gen. 20:1	14. Gen. 20:1	17. Gen. 20:1			G
18. Gen. 21:1	18. Gen. 21:1	17. Gen. 21:1	15. Gen. 21:1	18. Gen. 21:1			G
19. Gen. 22:1	19. Gen. 22:1	18. Gen. 22:1	16. Gen. 22:1	19. Gen. 22:1			G
20. Gen. 24:1	20. Gen. 24:1	19. Gen. 24:1	17. Gen. 24:1	20. Gen. 24:1			G
21. Gen. 24:42	21. Gen. 24:42	20. Gen. 24:42	18. Gen. 24:42	21. Gen. 24:42			G
22. Gen. 25:1	22. Gen. 25:1	21. Gen. 25:1	19. Gen. 25:1	22. Gen. 25:1			G
23. Gen. 25:19	23. Gen. 25:19	22. Gen. 25:19	20. Gen. 25:19	23. Gen. 25:19			G
24. Gen. 27:1	24. Gen. 27:1	23. Gen. 27:1	21. Gen. 27:1	24. Gen. 27:1			G
25. Gen. 27:28	25. Gen. 27:28	24. Gen. 27:28	22. Gen. 27:28	25. Gen. 27:28			G
26. Gen. 28:10	26. Gen. 28:10	25. Gen. 28:10	23. Gen. 28:10	26. Gen. 28:10			G
27. Gen. 29:31	27. Gen. 29:31	26. Gen. 29:31	24. Gen. 29:31	27. Gen. 29:31		Y	G
28. Gen. 30:22	28. Gen. 30:22	27. Gen. 30:22	25. Gen. 30:22	28. Gen. 30:22		Y	G
29. Gen. 31:3	29. Gen. 31:3	28. Gen. 31:3	26. Gen. 31:3	29. Gen. 31:3		Y	G
30. Gen. 32:4	30. Gen. 32:4	29. Gen. 32:4	27. Gen. 32:4	30. Gen. 32:4		Y	G
31. Gen. 33:18	31. Gen. 33:18	30. Gen. 33:18	28. Gen. 33:18	31. Gen. 33:18		Y	G
<b>32. Gen. 35:9</b>	<b>32. Gen. 35:9</b>	<b>31. Gen. 35:9</b>	<b>29. Gen. 35:9</b>	<b>32. Gen. 35:1</b> <sup>90</sup>		<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>
33. Gen. 37:1	33. Gen. 37:1	32. Gen. 37:1	30. Gen. 37:1	33. Gen. 37:1		Y	G
34. Gen. 38:1	34. Gen. 38:1	33. Gen. 38:1	31. Gen. 38:1	34. Gen. 38:1		Y	G
35. Gen. 39:1	35. Gen. 39:1	34. Gen. 39:1	32. Gen. 39:1	35. Gen. 39:1		Y	G
<b>36. Gen. 40:1</b>	<b>36. Gen. 40:1</b>						
37. Gen. 41:1	37. Gen. 41:1	35. Gen. 41:1	33. Gen. 41:1	36. Gen. 41:1			G
<b>38. Gen. 41:38</b>	<b>38. Gen. 41:38</b>	<b>36. Gen. 41:38</b>	<b>34. Gen. 41:39</b> <sup>91</sup>	<b>37. Gen. 41:38</b>			<b>38</b>
39. Gen. 42:18	39. Gen. 42:18	37. Gen. 42:18	35. Gen. 42:18	38. Gen. 42:18			G
40. Gen. 43:14	40. Gen. 43:14	38. Gen. 43:14	36. Gen. 43:14	39. Gen. 43:14			G
41. Gen. 44:18	41. Gen. 44:18	39. Gen. 44:18	37. Gen. 44:18	40. Gen. 44:18		Y	G
42. Gen. 46:28	42. Gen. 46:28	40. Gen. 46:28	38. Gen. 46:28	41. Gen. 46:28			G
43. Gen. 48:1	43. Gen. 48:1	41. Gen. 48:1	39. Gen. 48:1	42. Gen. 48:1		Y	G
<b>44. Gen. 49:1</b>	<b>44. Gen. 49:1</b>	<b>42. Gen. 49:1</b>		<b>43. Gen. 49:1</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>45. Gen. 49:27</b>	<b>45. Gen. 49:27</b>	<b>43. Gen. 49:27</b> <sup>92</sup>					<b>(G)</b>

<sup>89</sup> The numbering skips #10 here. Given that the total actual *s'darim* number 153, it seems likely there was a missed *seder*. There are no sources with a *seder* between 12:10 and 14:1, however. The numbering of 43 *s'darim* in Genesis (despite iterating 42) is consistent with other sources, including Bomberg. It could be that both this list and the one in Bomberg have a common ancestor, both omitting the same *seder* at the end of Genesis from the list.

<sup>90</sup> This is the only source with a *seder* break here. It is possible this is a scribal error where the word ויאמר was written instead of וירא in the indicated phrase.

<sup>91</sup> This is the only source with a *seder* break here. It seems likely to be a scribal error, as both this verse and verse 38 (indicated in all other sources) start ... ויאמר פרעה אל... and both are in the middle of the paragraph.

Len. Codex (body)	Len. Codex (end notes)	Bomberg	Dam. Keter (body)	Dam. Keter (notes)	Aleppo Co- dex	Y	G
46. Ex. 1:1	46. Ex. 1:1	44. Ex. 1:1	40. Ex. 1:1	44. Ex. 1:1			G
	<b>47. Ex. 2:1</b>						
47. Ex. 3:1	48. Ex. 3:1	45. Ex. 3:1	41. Ex. 3:1	45. Ex. 3:1		Y	G
48. Ex. 4:18	49. Ex. 4:18	46. Ex. 4:18	42. Ex. 4:18	46. Ex. 4:18		Y	G
49. Ex. 6:2	50. Ex. 6:2	47. Ex. 6:2	43. Ex. 6:2	47. Ex. 6:2			G
50. Ex. 7:8	51. Ex. 7:8	48. Ex. 7:8	44. Ex. 7:8	48. Ex. 7:8		Y	(G)
51. Ex. 8:16	52. Ex. 8:16	49. Ex. 8:16	45. Ex. 8:16	49. Ex. 8:16		Y	G
52. Ex. 10:1	53. Ex. 10:1	50. Ex. 10:1	46. Ex. 10:1	50. Ex. 10:1		Y	G
53. Ex. 11:1	54. Ex. 11:1	51. Ex. 11:1	47. Ex. 11:1	51. Ex. 11:1			G
54. Ex. 12:29	55. Ex. 12:29	52. Ex. 12:29	48. Ex. 12:29	52. Ex. 12:29		Y	G
55. Ex. 13:1	56. Ex. 13:1	53. Ex. 13:1	49. Ex. 13:1	53. Ex. 13:1		Y	G
56. Ex. 14:15	57. Ex. 14:15	54. Ex. 14:15	50. Ex. 14:15	54. Ex. 14:15			G
57. Ex. 16:4	58. Ex. 16:4	55. Ex. 16:4	51. Ex. 16:4	55. Ex. 16:4			(G)
<b>58. Ex. 16:28</b>	<b>59. Ex. 16:28</b>	<b>56. Ex. 16:28</b>		<b>56. Ex. 16:28</b>			<b>G</b>
59. Ex. 18:1	60. Ex. 18:1	57. Ex. 18:1	52. Ex. 18:1	57. Ex. 18:1			G
60. Ex. 19:6	61. Ex. 19:6	58. Ex. 19:6	53. Ex. 19:6	58. Ex. 19:6		Y	G
61. Ex. 21:1	62. Ex. 21:1	59. Ex. 21:1	54. Ex. 21:1	59. Ex. 21:1		Y	G
62. Ex. 22:24	63. Ex. 22:24	60. Ex. 22:24	55. Ex. 22:24	60. Ex. 22:24			G
<b>63. Ex. 23:20</b>	<b>64. Ex. 23:20</b>						
64. Ex. 25:1	65. Ex. 25:1	61. Ex. 25:1	56. Ex. 25:1	61. Ex. 25:1			G
65. Ex. 26:1	66. Ex. 26:1	62. Ex. 26:1	57. Ex. 26:1	62. Ex. 26:1		Y	G
66. Ex. 26:31	67. Ex. 26:31	63. Ex. 26:31	58. Ex. 26:31	63. Ex. 26:31		Y	G
67. Ex. 27:20	68. Ex. 27:20	64. Ex. 27:20	59. Ex. 27:20	64. Ex. 27:20			G
68. Ex. 29:1	69. Ex. 29:1	65. Ex. 29:1	60. Ex. 29:1	65. Ex. 29:1			G
69. Ex. 30:1	70. Ex. 30:1	66. Ex. 30:1	61. Ex. 30:1	66. Ex. 30:1			G
70. Ex. 31:1	71. Ex. 31:1	67. Ex. 31:1	62. Ex. 31:1	67. Ex. 31:1			<b>18 G</b>
71. Ex. 32:15	72. Ex. 32:15	68. Ex. 32:15	63. Ex. 32:15	68. Ex. 32:15		Y	G
<b>72. Ex. 34:1</b>	<b>73. Ex. 34:1</b>						
73. Ex. 34:27	74. Ex. 34:27	69. Ex. 34:27	64. Ex. 34:27	69. Ex. 34:27			G
<b>74. Ex. 35:30</b>	<b>75. Ex. 35:30</b>						
75. Ex. 37:1	76. Ex. 37:1	70. Ex. 37:1	65. Ex. 37:1	70. Ex. 37:1			G
76. Ex. 38:21	77. Ex. 38:21	71. Ex. 38:21	66. Ex. 38:21	71. Ex. 38:21			G
77. Ex. 39:33	78. Ex. 39:33	72. Ex. 39:33	67. Ex. 39:33	72. Ex. 39:33			G
78. Lev. 1:1	79. Lev. 1:1	73. Lev. 1:1	68. Lev. 1:1 <sup>93</sup>	73. Lev. 1:1		Y	G
79. Lev. 4:1	80. Lev. 4:1	74. Lev. 4:1		74. Lev. 4:1		Y	G
<b>80. Lev. 5:1</b>	<b>81. Lev. 5:1</b>		<b>69. Lev. 5:14</b>				<b>1</b>
81. Lev. 6:12	82. Lev. 6:12	75. Lev. 6:12	70. Lev. 6:12	75. Lev. 6:12		Y	G
82. Lev. 8:1	83. Lev. 8:1	76. Lev. 8:1	71. Lev. 8:1	76. Lev. 8:1		Y	G
							9:1
83. Lev. 10:8	84. Lev. 10:8	77. Lev. 10:8	72. Lev. 10:8	77. Lev. 10:8			G
84. Lev. 11:1	85. Lev. 11:1	78. Lev. 11:1	73. Lev. 11:1	78. Lev. 11:1			G
85. Lev. 12:1	86. Lev. 12:1	79. Lev. 12:1	74. Lev. 12:1	79. Lev. 12:1			G
86. Lev. 13:29	87. Lev. 13:29	80. Lev. 13:29	75. Lev. 13:29	80. Lev. 13:29			G
87. Lev. 14:1	88. Lev. 14:1	81. Lev. 14:1	76. Lev. 14:1	81. Lev. 14:1		Y	G
<b>88. Lev. 14:33</b>	<b>89. Lev. 14:33</b>	<b>82. Lev. 14:33</b>		<b>82. Lev. 14:33</b>		Y	<b>G</b>
89. Lev. 15:1	90. Lev. 15:1	83. Lev. 15:1	77. Lev. 15:1	83. Lev. 15:1		Y	G
90. Lev. 15:25	91. Lev. 15:25	84. Lev. 15:25	78. Lev. 15:25	84. Lev. 15:25		Y	G

<sup>92</sup> The listing specifies 43 *s'darim* in Genesis, but the iteration only goes up to #42. Presumably the last *sefer* was dropped off the list.

<sup>93</sup> Not marked or counted as a *sefer*, but presumably an oversight.

Len. Codex (body)	Len. Codex (end notes)	Bomberg	Dam. Keter (body)	Dam. Keter (notes)	Aleppo Co- dex	Y	G
91. Lev. 17:1	92. Lev. 17:1	85. Lev. 17:1	79. Lev. 17:1	85. Lev. 17:1			G
<b>92. Lev. 18:1</b>	<b>93. Lev. 18:1</b>	<b>86. Lev. 18:1</b>		<b>86. Lev. 18:1</b>			<b>G</b>
93. Lev. 19:1	94. Lev. 19:1	87. Lev. 19:1	80. Lev. 19:1	87. Lev. 19:1			G
94. Lev. 19:23	95. Lev. 19:23	88. Lev. 19:23	81. Lev. 19:23	88. Lev. 19:23		Y	G
95. Lev. 21:1	96. Lev. 21:1	89. Lev. 21:1	82. Lev. 21:1	89. Lev. 21:1		Y	G
96. Lev. 22:17	97. Lev. 22:17	90. Lev. 22:17	83. Lev. 22:17	90. Lev. 22:17		Y	G
<b>97. Lev. 23:9</b>	<b>98. Lev. 23:9</b>	<b>91. Lev. 23:15</b>	<b>84. Lev. 23:15</b>	<b>91. Lev. 23:15</b>			<b>9</b>
<b>98. Lev. 24:1</b>	<b>99. Lev. 24:1</b>						
<b>99. Lev. 25:14</b>	<b>100. Lev. 25:14</b>	<b>92. Lev. 25:14</b>		<b>92. Lev. 25:14</b>		Y	<b>G</b>
100. Lev. 25:35	101. Lev. 25:35	93. Lev. 25:35	85. Lev. 25:35	93. Lev. 25:35		Y	G
101. Lev. 26:3	102. Lev. 26:3	94. Lev. 26:3	86. Lev. 26:3	94. Lev. 26:3		Y	G
102. Lev. 27:1	103. Lev. 27:1	95. Lev. 27:1	87. Lev. 27:1	95. Lev. 27:1			G
103. Num. 1:1	104. Num. 1:1	96. Num. 1:1	88. Num. 1:1	96. Num. 1:1		Y	G
104. Num. 2:1	105. Num. 2:1	97. Num. 2:1	89. Num. 2:1	97. Num. 2:1			G
105. Num. 3:1	106. Num. 3:1	98. Num. 3:1	90. Num. 3:1	98. Num. 3:1		Y	G
106. Num. 4:17	107. Num. 4:17	99. Num. 4:17	91. Num. 4:17	99. Num. 4:17		Y	G
107. Num. 5:11	108. Num. 5:11	100. Num. 5:11	92. Num. 5:11	100. Num. 5:11		Y	G
<b>108. Num. 6:1</b>	<b>109. Num. 6:1</b>						
109. Num. 6:22	110. Num. 6:22	101. Num. 6:22	93. Num. 6:22	101. Num. 6:22		Y	G
110. Num. 7:48	111. Num. 7:48	102. Num. 7:48	94. Num. 7:48	102. Num. 7:48			G
111. Num. 8:1	112. Num. 8:1	103. Num. 8:1	95. Num. 8:1	103. Num. 8:1		Y	G
112. Num. 10:1	113. Num. 10:1	104. Num. 10:1	96. Num. 10:1	104. Num. 10:1		Y	G
113. Num. 11:16	114. Num. 11:16	105. Num. 11:16	97. Num. 11:16	105. Num. 11:16			G
<b>114. Num. 11:23</b>	<b>115. Num. 11:23</b>	<b>106. Num. 11:23</b>		<b>106. Num. 11:23</b>			<b>G</b>
115. Num. 13:1	116. Num. 13:1	107. Num. 13:1	98. Num. 13:1	107. Num. 13:1		Y	G
116. Num. 14:11	117. Num. 14:11	108. Num. 14:11	99. Num. 14:11	108. Num. 14:11		Y	G
117. Num. 15:1	118. Num. 15:1	109. Num. 15:1	100. Num. 15:1	109. Num. 15:1		Y	G
118. Num. 16:1	119. Num. 16:1	110. Num. 16:1	101. Num. 16:1	110. Num. 16:1		Y	G
119. Num. 17:16	120. Num. 17:16	111. Num. 17:16	102. Num. 17:16	111. Num. 17:16		Y	G
<b>120. Num. 19:1</b>	<b>121. Num. 19:1</b>	<b>112. Num. 18:25</b>	<b>103. Num. 18:25</b>	<b>112. Num. 18:25</b>		Y	<b>25</b>
121. Num. 20:14	122. Num. 20:14	113. Num. 20:14	104. Num. 20:14	113. Num. 20:14		Y	G
122. Num. 22:2	123. Num. 22:2	114. Num. 22:2	105. Num. 22:2	114. Num. 22:2		Y	G
123. Num. 23:10	124. Num. 23:10	115. Num. 23:10	106. Num. 23:10	115. Num. 23:10		Y	G
124. Num. 25:1	125. Num. 25:1	116. Num. 25:1		116. Num. 25:1			G
125. Num. 25:10	126. Num. 25:10	117. Num. 25:10	107. Num. 25:10	117. Num. 25:10		Y	G
126. Num. 26:52	127. Num. 26:52	118. Num. 26:52		118. Num. 26:52		Y	G
127. Num. 27:15	128. Num. 27:15	119. Num. 27:15	108. Num. 27:15	119. Num. 27:15			G
128. Num. 28:26	129. Num. 28:26	120. Num. 28:26	109. Num. 28:26	120. Num. 28:26		Y	G
129. Num. 30:2	130. Num. 30:2	121. Num. 30:2	110. Num. 30:2	121. Num. 30:2			G
<b>130. Num. 31:1</b>	<b>131. Num. 31:1</b>	<b>122. Num. 31:1</b>		<b>122. Num. 31:1</b>			<b>G</b>
131. Num. 31:25	132. Num. 31:25	123. Num. 31:25	111. Num. 31:25	123. Num. 31:25			(G)
132. Num. 32:1	133. Num. 32:1	124. Num. 32:1	112. Num. 32:1	124. Num. 32:1			G
133. Num. 33:1	134. Num. 33:1	125. Num. 33:1	113. Num. 33:1	125. Num. 33:1		Y	G
134. Num. 34:1	135. Num. 34:1	126. Num. 34:1	114. Num. 34:1	126. Num. 34:1			G
135. Num. 35:9	136. Num. 35:9	127. Num. 35:9	115. Num. 35:9	127. Num. 35:9			G
136. Deut. 1:1	137. Deut. 1:1	128. Deut. 1:1	116. Deut. 1:1	128. Deut. 1:1			G
137. Deut. 2:2	138. Deut. 2:2	129. Deut. 2:2	117. Deut. 2:2	129. Deut. 2:2		Y	G
138. Deut. 2:31	139. Deut. 2:31	130. Deut. 2:31	118. Deut. 2:31	130. Deut. 2:31		Y	G
139. Deut. 3:23	140. Deut. 3:23	131. Deut. 3:23	119. Deut. 3:23	131. Deut. 3:23			G
<b>140. Deut. 4:25</b>	<b>141. Deut. 4:25</b>						
141. Deut. 4:41	142. Deut. 4:41	132. Deut. 4:41	120. Deut. 4:41	132. Deut. 4:41			G
142. Deut. 6:4	143. Deut. 6:4	133. Deut. 6:4	121. Deut. 6:4	133. Deut. 6:4		Y	G
143. Deut. 7:12	144. Deut. 7:12	134. Deut. 7:12	122. Deut. 7:12	134. Deut. 7:12		Y	G
144. Deut. 9:1	145. Deut. 9:1	135. Deut. 9:1	123. Deut. 9:1	135. Deut. 9:1			G



Len. Codex (body)	Len. Codex (end notes)	Bomberg	Dam. Keter (body)	Dam. Keter (notes)	Aleppo Co- dex	Y	G
145.Deut. 10:1	146.Deut. 10:1	136.Deut. 10:1	124. Deut. 10:1	136. Deut. 10:1		Y	G
146.Deut. 11:10	147.Deut. 11:10	137.Deut. 11:10	125. Deut. 11:10	137. Deut. 11:10			G
147.Deut. 12:20	148.Deut. 12:20	138.Deut. 12:20	126. Deut. 12:20	138. Deut. 12:20			G
<b>148.Deut. 13:2</b>	<b>149.Deut. 13:2</b>						
149.Deut. 14:1	150.Deut. 14:1	139.Deut. 14:1	127. Deut. 14:1	139. Deut. 14:1			G
150.Deut. 15:7	151.Deut. 15:7	140.Deut. 15:7	128. Deut. 15:7	140. Deut. 15:7		Y	G
151.Deut. 16:18	152.Deut. 16:18	141.Deut. 16:18	129. Deut. 16:18	141. Deut. 16:18			G
152.Deut. 17:14	153.Deut. 17:14	142.Deut. 17:14	130. Deut. 17:14	142. Deut. 17:14		Y	G
<b>153.Deut. 18:14</b>	<b>154.Deut. 18:14</b>						
154.Deut. 20:1							
155.Deut. 20:10	155.Deut. 20:10	143.Deut. 20:10	131. Deut. 20:10	143. Deut. 20:10			G
<b>156.Deut. 21:10</b>	<b>156.Deut. 21:10</b>						
157.Deut. 22:6	157.Deut. 22:6	144.Deut. 22:6	132. Deut. 22:6	144. Deut. 22:6		Y	G
158.Deut. 23:10	158.Deut. 23:10	145.Deut. 23:10	133. Deut. 23:10	145. Deut. 23:10			G
159.Deut. 23:22	159.Deut. 23:22	146.Deut. 23:22	134. Deut. 23:22	146. Deut. 23:22			G
160.Deut. 24:19	160.Deut. 24:19	147.Deut. 24:19	135. Deut. 24:19	147. Deut. 24:19		Y	G
161.Deut. 26:1	161.Deut. 26:1	148.Deut. 26:1	136. Deut. 26:1	148. Deut. 26:1			G
<b>162.Deut. 28:1</b>	<b>162.Deut. 28:1</b>	<b>149.Deut. 28:1</b>	<b>137. Deut. 28:15</b>	<b>149. Deut. 28:1</b>		Y	G
163.Deut. 29:9	163.Deut. 29:9	150.Deut. 29:9	138. Deut. 29:9	150. Deut. 29:9	Deut. 29:9	Y	G
164.Deut. 30:11	164.Deut. 30:11	151.Deut. 30:11	139. Deut. 30:11	151. Deut. 30:11	Deut. 30:11		G
<b>165.Deut. 31:14</b>	<b>165.Deut. 31:14</b>	<b>152.Deut. 31:14</b>		<b>152. Deut. 31:14</b>	<b>Deut. 31:14</b>	Y	G
166.Deut. 32:1	166.Deut. 32:1	153.Deut. 32:1	140. Deut. 32:1	153. Deut. 32:1	Deut. 32:1	Y	G
167.Deut. 33:1	167.Deut. 33:1	154.Deut. 33:1	141. Deut. 33:1	154. Deut. 33:1	Deut. 33:1	Y	G

These manuscripts, though they are not in full agreement, provide us with vital information on the total number of *s'darim* and the locations of the breaks, at least as they were known in the 10<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Centuries. With few exceptions (bolded in the table), all the lists place the breaks at the same locations; albeit, some lists have more or less breaks than others. Because each of these listings is from a single source, they are superior to the information provided by *g'nizah* fragments and incomplete collections of *piyyutim*. Information from those partial sources can then be compared against the full lists to get a clearer picture of any development or local variations to the cycle.

Once again, a comparison to the breaks indicated in Yannai's *k'rovot* ("Y" column above) indicates that every single one of Yannai's *s'darim* with the exception of Exodus 31:18 matches up exactly with the *seder* breaks attested to in the Masoretic texts. Yannai's breaks, however, do not match any single Masoretic source. It seems Yannai certainly did not have the 141 *seder* system found in the Damascus Keter, since several of his *s'darim* are not found there, but found elsewhere. He has a *seder* at Genesis 11:1, only found in the Leningrad Codex, but he

also has one at Num. 18:25, found in all sources *other* than the Leningrad Codex. Nevertheless, the small number of differences is significant, and again suggests *seder* breaks were very consistent from Yannai's time onwards.

It is possible that Yannai's cycle of *k'rovot* itself played a role in standardizing the *seder* breaks. If they were popular in synagogues using the Sequential Triennial Cycle, those congregations might have standardized their reading on the breaks he used in order to utilize his *k'rovot*. With the few sources we have and the lack of knowledge about when Yannai lived, it is impossible to say whether or not this was the case.

A comparison against the *g'nizah* fragments ("G" column above) also has interesting results. It should be remembered that this column actually represents an amalgamation of many sources, and where there are explicitly conflicting sources, it has been indicated with parentheses. The Masoretic texts also confirm the projected *seder* breaking points that were not found explicitly in the *g'nizah* texts. The *g'nizah* information, like the Yannai *piyyutim*, is a poor match to the 141 *s'darim* in the body of the Damascus Keter, with many *s'darim* found in the *g'nizah* documents and not in the Keter.

Most of the *s'darim* found exclusively in the Leningrad Codex are not found in the *g'nizah* fragments, with three exceptions. Genesis 11:1 is in all the available *g'nizah* data on that part of the Torah, with four sources. Most of these sources are too short to compare against the Leningrad Codex in any meaningful way, but one (2727) covers a significant portion of the Torah. A comparison between this and the Codex indicates that despite the match early on, they do not represent a single tradition, as there are *s'darim* in each that do not appear in the other. The *g'nizah* sources also match Leviticus 23:9 which appears as a *seder* break in the Leningrad Codex, but the other Masoretic sources have 23:15 instead. The *g'nizah* evidence is thin here, with only two sources on this part of the Torah, both with a *seder* at 23:9, but it is conceivable that this alternate location could have been used in practice as well in other locations and we simply do not have evidence of it. Leviticus 5:1 is also found only in the Leningrad Codex, but we have *eight g'nizah* sources that testify to its use as a *seder* break, and none that testify against it.

Outside of these, the *g'nizah* information matches closely with both the Bomberg Bible and the notes of the Damascus Keter. Of interest is that while the former has a break at Genesis 8:1, but not 8:15, it is the opposite case in the latter, but we have two *g'nizah* sources that give both locations as breaks (including 2727), matching the Leningrad Codex. The *g'nizah* data also has a *seder* break at Leviticus 9:1, which is not found in any Masoretic source (nor Yannai's *piyyutim*). There are only two sources for this *seder*, so it is possible that it was not universally used as a *seder* break in the communities represented by the *g'nizah* fragments. It seems, based on the evidence, that there were a number of minor variations on where the *seder* breaks were located, and that the record we have from the Cairo G'nizah does not represent the full range of practices over all times and places.

The Masoretic text also marks *s'darim* in the Prophets and in the Writings. For a time, it was thought that the *haftarot* for the Sequential Triennial Cycle were connected to the *s'darim* of the Prophets. In 1940, Jacob Mann wrote, "Very frequently the Bible codices contain the siglum 'ס=קט either at the verse where the [*haftarah*] began or where it ended, and moreover the concluding verse of 'happy ending' added after the skipping, often coincides with the one having this siglum."<sup>94</sup> Mann used this assumption to guess the start and end points of various *haftarot* for which he had little or no information.

Unfortunately, Mann's hypothesis did not hold up under a full examination of the sources. A full analysis of all the texts available in 1989 was done by Jacob Offer, which concluded that only 9.5% of the beginnings of known *haftarot* concluded with Masoretic *seder* markings and 15.1% of the unique ending points for *haftarot* coincided. Offer postulates that the *seder* divisions for the Prophets and Writings were for the purpose of an independent study/reading cycle and were unconnected to the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He attributes the higher percent for the coincidence of ending points to the fact that it was common for both the

---

<sup>94</sup> Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue, Volume I*, Ktav Publishing House, Inc.: New York, 1971, 10.

*haftarot* and the study/reading cycle to seek a positive verse to end on, and so they occasionally chose the same verse.<sup>95</sup>

By Maimonides' time in the 12th century, the Annual Cycle was widespread, but the Sequential Triennial Cycle was still known to him as a minority practice:

המנהג הפשוט בכל ישראל, שמשלימין את התורה בשנה אחת: מתחילין בשבת שאחר חג הסוכות, וקורין בסדר "בראשית"; בשנייה, "אלה, תולדות נוח"; בשלישית, "ויאמר ה' אל אברם". וקוראין והולכין על הסדר הזה, עד שגומרין התורה בחג הסוכות. ויש מי שמשלים את התורה בשלוש שנים, ואינו מנהג פשוט.

The ordinary practice in all of Israel is that we complete the Torah in one year. We begin on the Shabbat that is after the festival of Sukkot, and read "In the beginning"; on the second [week], "These are the generations of Noah"; on the third, "And ADONAI said to Abram". And we read go in this order until we complete the Torah on the Festival of Sukkot. And there are those who complete the Torah in three years, and this is not the ordinary practice.<sup>96</sup>

He goes on to spell out how the Annual Cycle is fixed to the calendar, and imply that this is not so with the Sequential Triennial Cycle:

עזרא תיקן להם לישראל, שיהיו קורין קללות שבספר ויקרא, קודם עצרת; ושבמשנה תורה, קודם ראש השנה. והמנהג הפשוט, שיהיו קוראין "במדבר סיני", קודם עצרת; "ואתחנן", אחר תשעה באב; ו"אתם ניצבים", קודם ראש השנה; ו"צו את אהרון", קודם הפסח בשנה פשוטה. לפיכך יש שבתות שקוראין בשחרית, שני סדרים... כדי שישלימו בשנה, ויקראו אותם הסדרים בעונתן.

"Ezra decreed for Israel that they will read the curses in Torat Kohanim [i.e. Leviticus] prior to Atzeret [i.e. Shavuot] and those in Mishneh Torah [i.e. Deuteronomy] prior to Rosh Hashanah." And the ordinary practice is that we will read "In the wilderness of Sinai" before Atzeret, "And I pleaded" after Tisha B'Av, "You are standing" before Rosh Hashanah, "Command Aaron" before Pesah in an ordinary year [i.e. when there is no extra month]. Therefore, there are Shabbatot that

---

<sup>95</sup> Jacob Offer, "The Masoretic Divisions (Sedarim) in the Books of Prophets and Hagiographa", *Tarbiz*, Dec. 1988: 170-172.

<sup>96</sup> Mishneh Torah Hilkhoh Tefillah 13:1.

we read two *s'darim*... in order that they will finish in a year, and the *s'darim* will be read in their seasons...<sup>97</sup>

The implication here is that the Sequential Triennial Cycle does not follow the decree of Ezra, is not fixed to the calendar, and does not combine portions to make it fit into a prescribed time period. An interesting side note is that in Maimonides' usage, "*s'darim*" is not used exclusively for the Sequential Triennial Cycle.

Around the same time, Benjamin of Tudela travelled to Egypt and described what he observed in Old Cairo:

ושם שני בתי כנסיות אחת לאנשי ארץ ישראל ואחת לאנשי ארץ בבל. וקוראין לכנסת אנשי ארץ ישראל כנסי אל שאמיין. ולכנסת אנשי בבל כנסי אל עראקיין. ואינ' נוהגין כולם מנהג אחד בפרשיות ובסדרים של תורה כי אנשי בבל נוהגין לקרות בכל שבוע פרשה כמו שעושי' בספרד וכמנהגנו שאנו נוהגין. ובכל שנה ושנה מסיימין את התורה. ואנשי ארץ ישר' אינ', נוהגין כך אבל עושין מכל פרשה ג' סדרים ומסיימין את התורה לסוף ג' שנים: ויש ביניהם מנהג ותקנה להתחבר כולן ולהתפלל ביחד ביום שמחת תורה וביום מתן תורה.

And there [are found] are two synagogues, one of the people of Eretz Yisrael, and one of the people of Eretz Bavel. And the synagogue of the people of Eretz Yisrael is called the Syrian Synagogue. And the synagogue of the Babylonian Jews is called the Iraqi Synagogue. They do not all follow one *minhag* regarding the *parashiyot* and the *s'darim* of the Torah. The people of Babylonia follow reading a *parashah* every week, like what is done in Spain, and like the *minhag* that we follow, and they finish the Torah each and every year. The people of Eretz Yisrael do not practice such, but make three *s'darim* out of each *parashah*, and finish the Torah at the end of three years. And there is a *minhag* and enactment for all of them to join together and pray together on the day of Simḥat Torah and on the day of the giving of the Torah.<sup>98</sup>

There is a wealth of information in this short passage. We learn that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was still in use in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and that it was used outside the Eretz Yisrael. We have confirmation of the terminology of *parashah* for the Annual Cycle and *seder* for the Se-

---

<sup>97</sup> Mishneh Torah Hilkhoh Tefillah 13:2.

<sup>98</sup> Benjamin ben Yonah, Marcus Nathan Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, Phillip Feldheim, Inc.: London 1907, 62-63 (Hebrew side).

quential Triennial Cycle. We also have a historical precedent for the practice of both reading cycles in the same city, and see how both congregations came together to celebrate Simḥat Torah. His description of each *parashah* being split into three *s'darim* is off the mark from the *g'nizah* evidence, which shows this to be sometimes true, but a *parashah* might also be two or four *s'darim* or not even share a common start and/or end point. It is understandable, however, how a traveler unfamiliar with the system would have this simplified conception of the relationship of the divisions between the two systems and start from an Annual-Cycle-centered viewpoint.

Maimonides' son, Abraham Maimuni, also mentioned the Sequential Triennial Cycle in his writings:

I have seen with my own eyes in the town where I live-Kairo-two recognised synagogues, one of which was known as the Babylonian, where the practice accepted by all Jews in prayers and reading of the Law was adopted; the other, the Palestinian, had a different custom, for whereas in the former the whole weekly portion was read every Sabbath, in the latter only a Seder was recited. Again, in the former place of worship, Kedusha was recited standing, in the latter sitting; and still other variations in many respects. My father and certain sages attempted to smooth away these divergences of Minhag, but to no purpose, owing to the efforts of the worst of men and others.<sup>99</sup>

Not only does this help us establish that the Sequential Triennial Cycle continued in Old Cairo into the 14<sup>th</sup> century, but that Maimonides was opposed to the practice of the Sequential Triennial Cycle and tried unsuccessfully to eliminate it there. In the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century, the Egyptian historian Makrizi wrote of the existence of two synagogues in Old Cairo, one of Palestinian origin and one of Babylonian origin.<sup>100</sup> The Jewish historian Sambari also wrote of the two synagogues in 1670, and he also mentions the Sequential Triennial Cycle, but it is unclear if the latter is a description of the situation at present or in the past, and his language is so similar to that of

---

<sup>99</sup> Translation of the Arabic השם לעובדי from Adolf Büchler, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Apr. 1893: 422.

<sup>100</sup> Elinoar Bareket. *Fustat on the Nile: The Jewish Elite in Medieval Egypt*, Leiden: Brill 1999, 17.

Benjamin of Tudela that it seems that he must have been basing it on that text.<sup>101</sup> Nevertheless, the continued existence of both synagogues suggests that perhaps the Sequential Triennial Cycle was still in use there as late as the 15<sup>th</sup> or even the 17<sup>th</sup> century. It is unknown when the Sequential Triennial Cycle ceased to be practiced in Old Cairo or which other communities might have used it.

In summary, we have seen that in the post-Amoraic period:

- There were set *seder* breaks which were largely consistent throughout the period, though there were minor variations.
- There seems to be a preference for a reading to begin and end on a positive note.
- There were set beginnings for the associated *haftarot*, again largely consistent with a few variations.
- The number of *s'darim* reported in various sources is inconsistent, though 154 appears in multiple sources and fits the *g'nizah* evidence of actual practice well.
- Some of the *s'darim* were shorter than twenty-one verses, and it remains unclear how the seven readings of three verses were performed.
- The *haftarot* were typically short, often containing only three to eleven verses.
- The *haftarot* were selected primarily based on verbal tallying between the first verse or two of the *seder* and *haftarah*.
- The lengths and end points for any given *haftarah* as well as any skipping within it varied considerably.
- Aramaic translators were likely still in use.

---

<sup>101</sup> Joseph Sambari and Adolf Neubauer Ed., *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1887, 188.

- The cycle was likely not fixed to a calendar of exactly three years.
- Different localities read different *s'darim* on the same week.
- The Romaniote and Karaite *haftarot* for the Annual Cycle were derived from those of the Sequential Triennial Cycle.
- Old Cairo was the last reported place where the cycle was practiced, and both cycles were practiced in the same city, joining together to celebrate whenever one was restarting its cycle.

### ***Modern Scholarship on the Sequential Triennial Cycle***

In recent centuries, very little was known about the Sequential Triennial Cycle until the discovery of the documents in the Cairo Genizah. The *s'darim* marked in the Masorah were certainly known, but little else survived. By the 1890's, it was already recognized that there was a relationship between the divisions of some Midrashic texts and the *s'darim*, but the first major step in reconstructing the cycle occurred when Adolph Büchler<sup>102</sup> published a *g'nizah* fragment with a list of *haftarot* from the Sequential Triennial Cycle covering most of Genesis, all of Exodus, and a few *s'darim* of Leviticus (the list we now call "2727"). He recognized a number of the distinct features of the cycle's *haftarot*, including their short length, the relationship to the Karaite *haftarot*, and the verbal tallying.

He attempted to match the triennial cycle *s'darim* up with readings for Festivals and specific events in the narrative, applying traditional rabbinical dates for events such as the death of Moses. This led him to conclude that the sequential triennial cycle always began on the first Shabbat in Nissan (one of the four Jewish New Years) and ended early in Adar. The remaining

---

<sup>102</sup> See footnote 99 above.



weeks of Adar would have been taken up by the four special portions which were read in place of the normal Shabbat readings. He also assumed that Torah readings on Festivals were part of the reading cycle itself, and his theory was that many of the Annual Cycle Festival portions derive from the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Additionally, he connected the beginning of the reading of each book of the Torah to one of the four Jewish New Years. The following table illustrates how Büchler aligned the cycle to the calendar.<sup>103</sup>

**Table 6: Büchler’s Mapping of the Sequential Triennial Cycle to a Fixed Calendar**

Seder	Year	Date	Event
Genesis 1:1	1	Nissan 1	New Year
<b>Genesis 3:24</b>	1	Nissan 15	Pesaḥ Day 1; Adam’s sons brought Pesaḥ offering
Genesis 6:9	1	Iyar 1X	“The 17 <sup>th</sup> Day of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> month”
Genesis 30:22	1	Tishrei 1	New Year; Rachel remembered on New Year’s day
Exodus 1:1	1	Sh’vat 1X	New Year for Trees
<b>Exodus 12:1</b>	2	Nissan 3	Prepare the Pesaḥ lamb
<b>Exodus 12:21</b>	2	Nissan 10	Carrying out of Pesaḥ lamb/1 <sup>st</sup> Day Pesaḥ
<b>Exodus 12:37</b>	2	Nissan 17	Encampment at Sukkot
<b>Exodus 14:9</b>	2	Nissan 21	Crossing of Sea/7 <sup>th</sup> Day Pesaḥ
<b>Exodus 15:22</b>	2	Nissan 24	Found water
<b>Exodus 16:1</b>	2	Iyar 1	Manna
Exodus 16:28	2	Iyar 8	Manna
<b>Exodus 17:1</b>	2	Iyar 15	
Exodus 18:1	2	Iyar 22	
Exodus 19:6	2	Iyar 29	Ten Commandments/Shavuot
Exodus 21:1	2	Sivan 7	
Exodus 22:24	2	Sivan 14	
<b>Exodus 34:1</b>	2	Av 29	Moses ascends w/ 2 <sup>nd</sup> tablets
Leviticus 1:1	2	Elul 2X	New Year
Leviticus 5:1	2	Tishrei X	
<b>Leviticus 6:12</b>	2	Tishrei X	
Leviticus 8:1	2	Tishrei 10	Yom Kippur
Numbers 1:1	2	Shevat XX	New Year for Trees
Numbers 6:22	3	Adar 29	Dedication of Mishkan
Numbers 7:48	3	Nissan 7	7 <sup>th</sup> Day of Dedication
Numbers 8:1	3	Nissan 14	
<b>Numbers 9:1</b>	3	Nissan 15	Pesaḥ

<sup>103</sup> Büchler, 432-444.

Seder	Year	Date	Event
<b>Numbers 25</b>	3	Iyar 22	Second Shabbat in wilderness violated
<b>Numbers 36</b>	3	Av 2X	Tu B'Av/intermarriage of tribes permitted
Deuteronomy 1:1	3	Elul 1	New Year
<b>Deuteronomy 5</b>	3	Tishrei 1	Rosh Hashanah
Deuteronomy 6:4	3	Tishrei 8	
<b>Deuteronomy 34</b>	3	Adar 7	Death of Moses

Büchler also assumed that the *haftarot* for the various Festivals and other special occasions as listed in the Talmud represented the original Sequential Triennial Cycle *haftarot* for the associated Festival *s'darim* as they fell in the course of the cycle, and that there would have been different *s'darim* and *haftarot* read on those Festivals for each year of the cycle. Büchler's articles were the first to reveal that the Sequential Triennial Cycle used almost entirely different *haftarot* from the Annual Cycle based on a different set of standards, and that led to other scholars investigating and theorizing on this subject.

The most comprehensive attempt to determine the actual development practice of the Sequential Triennial Cycle over the course of all the centuries it was in place was that of Jacob Mann in the multivolume *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*. The first volume covering the *s'darim* up through the one beginning Exodus 39:33 was published in 1940, with the intention of producing a second volume covering the rest of the Shabbat *s'darim* and those for Festivals and other special occasions, and a third volume devoted to the Annual Cycle, the history of Torah reading, and a literary history of the *midrashim*.<sup>104</sup> Unfortunately, the untimely death of Mann later in 1940 interfered with these plans. A second volume based on Mann's notes was published in 1966 covering *s'darim* up to, but not including the one starting at Numbers 6:22. A second edition of the first volume was published in 1971 with a Prolegomenon by Ben Zion Wacholder providing a summary of the conclusions of Sequential Triennial Cycle scholarship that followed on in the decades after Mann's first edition.

---

<sup>104</sup> Mann, I, LXXXVII.

Mann's work was based on all the sources available to him at the time, including many of the Yannai *piyyutim*, a number of the *g'nizah* fragments that recorded *s'darim* and *haftarot*, and a great deal of Midrashic material, some of which was collected from *g'nizah* fragments previously unpublished. In fact, much of his work is connected to a theory of his that many Midrashic works were based around the *s'darim* and *haftarot* if the Sequential Triennial Cycle as it existed at the time, and therefore the list of *s'darim* and *haftarot* could be determined by analyzing those texts. Additionally, he thought the development of the *midrashim* and the cycle could be determined by an analysis of all the sources.

The greatest difficulty with the Sequential Triennial Cycle in the early texts is the *baraita* in the Bavli<sup>105</sup> regarding the reading of the sections of curses at fixed times on the annual calendar. Mann assumes that despite the attribution to Ezra, that this *baraita* was never accepted in Eretz Yisrael where the Sequential Triennial Cycle was practiced, as it is only found in the Bavli.<sup>106</sup> This is understandable, as it is difficult to reconcile any Sequential Triennial Cycle with this *baraita*, and yet the existence of such a cycle was well-attested to even in the Amoraic period.

While previous scholars had recognized the connections between the *seder* divisions and some of the Midrashic collections, Mann was the first to analyze the structure of these *midrashim* and attempt to connect them with the *haftarot* of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Mann calls Büchler's theory regarding a fixed cycle starting in Nissan "untenable," but does not provide a great deal of explanation, mentioning only that Büchler was unaware of the relationship between the *midrashim* and the *haftarot* and did not have the amount of *g'nizah* and *piyyut* information available to Mann.

Mann was not the only scholar of his time to reject Büchler's theory. Amongst those who criticized it was Ismar Elbogen, who in his pivotal work, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive His-*

---

<sup>105</sup> See footnote 17 above.

<sup>106</sup> Mann, I, 5.

tory, originally published in 1913, comments that it is “not supported by any weighty arguments.” Unlike Mann, however, he provides some explanation for his criticism. He points to the passage in the Bavli which explicitly mentions the Sequential Triennial Cycle<sup>107</sup> which appears in the context of the section of Sh’kalim from Numbers being read on two consecutive weeks in Adar - something which could not happen with a cycle beginning in Nissan. He also points out the flaw that Büchler’s calendrical theory would only have the sections for the four special Shabbatot during the last year of the cycle, when they are observed annually. Additionally, he notes that Büchler’s attempt to match the cycle to calendar dates is selective, choosing opinions of dates from one rabbi over another as convenient to fit his theory (accepting the same rabbi in one place and rejecting in another). It should, however, be pointed out that Elbogen himself assumes a fixed calendar cycle beginning after Sukkot, though there is no evidence of this either.<sup>108</sup>

Mann deals with the problem of short *s’darim* in a couple of different ways. He assumes that *s’darim* that have eighteen to twenty verses would have employed repetition of the last few verses by the seventh reader. However, when he encounters even shorter *s’darim*, he assumes that these did not actually exist at all and that the location of the *seder* break shifted from one place to another, and both were recorded for posterity. This does not accord well with the sources we have seen that have, for instance, 154 *s’darim*, but still have some very short ones.<sup>109</sup>

Mann’s theory regarding the *midrashim* was mainly regarding the *p’tihta* form, in which the *midrash* would open on a Biblical verse from the Prophets or Writings seemingly unrelated to the Torah reading and would, through a series of associations involving other Biblical verses, connect it back to a verse from the Torah reading (often the opening verse). These are likely to have originally been presented by a rabbi before or after the weekly Torah reading. This *p’tihtot*

---

<sup>107</sup> See footnote 1 above.

<sup>108</sup> Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*, The Jewish Publication Society: Philadelphia, 1993, 134, 421-422.

<sup>109</sup> Mann, I, 8.

could well be what the Rabbinic texts were referencing regarding permitting a shortened *haftarah* when there was a rabbi expounding upon the Torah reading.

The obvious way to connect a *midrash* to both the *seder* and its associated *haftarah* would be if the opening verse quoted the *p'tiḥta* were the opening verse of the *haftarah* (or perhaps any verse from it) and the *p'tiḥta*'s conclusion verse were the opening verse of the *seder*; however, Mann explains that this is not at all the case. Since these two verses are already linked by verbal tallying, using them would defeat the purpose of the *p'tiḥta* to start with a verse that seems completely unrelated and to demonstrate one's knowledge of the Biblical text and its unity by connecting it back to the Torah. If the *haftarah* starting verse is already known by the listener or reader, then the *p'tiḥta* would be less impressive if it started from that point. Mann's theory is that the opening verse of the *p'tiḥta* instead is an entirely different Biblical verse which has its own verbal tally with a verse of the *haftarah*. This second tally typically would not have been the same word or root that was used to tally the *haftarah* with the *seder*. Indeed, Mann tries to show that the content of the *p'tiḥta* references other verses from the *haftarah* as well, making the literary form all the more impressive.<sup>110</sup>

These types of *midrashim*, found in connection with the Sequential Triennial Cycle, can be found in the collections of B'reishit Rabbah, Vayyikra Rabbah, and the Tanḥuma texts. One style of *midrash* that seems to be particularly connected to the Sequential Triennial Cycle in this way are the "Y'lamm'deinu" *midrashim* that open with that word and a *halakhic* passage, usually from the Mishnah (but occasionally from the Gemara<sup>0</sup>, that serve as the opening of the *p'tikhta*. The *p'tikhta* eventually goes on to end in the opening verse of a *seder*. According to Mann's analysis, the subject of the *halakhah* chosen for the opening was always suggested by a verse from the *haftarah*. This style of *midrash* is quite distinct and formulaic, and so lends itself

---

<sup>110</sup> Mann, I, 12.

well to analysis. It is also thought to be a relatively late Midrashic style, and is found in collections such as Sh'mot Rabbah, D'varim Rabbah, and the different versions of the Tanhuma.<sup>111</sup>

Mann makes several assumptions that are not borne out in the evidence we have available today. He presumes, based on the passage regarding Rabbi Yoḥanan from the Bavli,<sup>112</sup> that Sequential Triennial Cycle *s'darim* were standardized at 10 verses, occasionally veering off this number by one verse.<sup>113</sup> He takes this to an extreme in his analysis of individual *haftarot*, assuming that if he finds a shorter *haftarah* it must be a scribal error, and if he finds a longer one, it must be that the scribe did not note skipping, and Mann then theorizes where the skip must have been.<sup>114</sup> The *g'nizah* evidence, while it strongly seems to prefer *haftarot* of about 10 verses, clearly establishes that the lengths were much more varied in practice. Along similar lines, he assumes that the extent of and skipping within the *haftarot* followed one unified custom in all communities and, where different texts do not match exactly, he tries to reconcile the conflicting texts or assumes there were scribal errors. The *g'nizah* evidence appears to make it much more likely that there simply was not standardization across different communities. This makes his conclusions regarding *the single haftarah* for each starting verse highly questionable.

Mann's assumptions about the relationship between the *midrashim* and the *haftarot* also assume that the former developed out of the latter, while it is possible that it was the *midrashim* that influenced the choice of *haftarot* in some communities or that they coincide because of simi-

---

<sup>111</sup> Mann, I, 13.

<sup>112</sup> See footnote 37 above.

<sup>113</sup> Mann, I, 9.

<sup>114</sup> An early example of this in his work is the *seder* at Genesis 8:1, where he does *both!* He had available to him five fragments as sources for the *haftarah*: Hab. 3:2 “until” 3:19, Hab. 3:2 “until” 3:5, Hab. 3:?-10-19, Hab. ?-3:17-19, and Hab. 3:2-9-? (the latter two could be from the same original document). From this, he concluded that the first fragment must have involved skipping that was not noted and the second was a scribal error. He then ignored everything but the final verse of the third and fourth sources to conclude that the *haftarah* was Hab. 3:2-9, 19. The logical conclusion to draw would have been one practice of 3:2-5, another of 3:2-19, and *perhaps* a third practice of 3:2-9, 17-19, but none of those is ten verses, so he did not consider them and created his own hybrid.

lar methods of connecting Torah and Prophets via verbal tallying. He recognizes that the *haftarot* purportedly referenced by the *midrashim* do not always match the evidence from the *g'nizah* and the *piyyutim*, and assumes that there was an early set of fixed *haftarot* (and locations for *seder* breaks) referenced by the *midrashim* that shifted over time to the later set represented by the other texts. He does not allow for the possibility that in the early period, the *haftarot* (and perhaps *s'darim*) were not actually fixed at all, or only on a community-by-community basis.

His methods of applying verbal tallying from known later *haftarot* backwards onto verses quoted in *midrashim*, while they often have merit, sometimes use very weak assumptions, tallying on words or concepts that appear frequently in the Prophetic texts, and therefore could be made to fit a number of places if desired. Additionally, Mann makes the somewhat bizarre claim that the *p'tiḥtot* would sometimes reference verses that were within the span of the *haftarah*, but were in the part that was skipped over.<sup>115</sup> This seems to be a result of his assumptions regarding *haftarah* length and skipping, and it seems much more likely that a community would have been reading the referenced verses on the same day that the *p'tiḥtah* was presented.

The only *seder* included in Mann's work for which he had no direct information as to where its *haftarah* began was Numbers 4:17. Today, we have four *g'nizah* fragments that all seem to point at Isaiah 48:9 as the starting point for the *haftarah*, explicitly extending to 48:19 in two of those cases. Mann analyzes the *midrashim* and comes to the conclusion that the *haftarah* was Zephaniah 3:7-15, 20. He does mention a *midrash* with a *p'tiḥta* that opens with Isaiah 48:9, but does not even consider that this might be the *haftarah*, probably because his theory assumes the opening verse of a *p'tiḥta* would not typically be the actual opening verse of the *haftarah*.<sup>116</sup> It is not impossible that Zephaniah 3:7 was indeed used as a *haftarah* for this *seder* in some place or time, but we have no independent evidence, and thus, the one case that tests the validity of Mann's theory is inconclusive at best. Nevertheless, his work in amassing the material from the

---

<sup>115</sup> Mann, I, 12.

<sup>116</sup> Mann, II, 201-205.

*g'nizah*, organizing it, and proposing theories of how the *haftarot* and *midrashim* were connected was essential to the study of the Sequential Triennial Cycle.

Ben Zion Wacholder's 1971 "Prolegomenon" provides a look at the state of Sequential Triennial Cycle scholarship 30 years after Mann, as well as presenting his own theories. He says that Mann failed to prove his hypothesis that the *haftarot* were more significant than the *s'darim* themselves in the creation of the *p'tihta* style *midrash*, and "the Tanhuma type of *midrash* were not consistently, or even frequently, as Mann claimed, inspired by the *haftarah*'s first verse." He also describes Mann as reporting *s'darim* that never actually existed, and *haftarot* that were erroneous.<sup>117</sup>

Wacholder believed that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was not, in fact, fixed to the calendar in any way, but that the weekly readings proceeded through the *s'darim* from beginning to end until the Torah was complete and then restarted. He makes an odd claim that the cycle, at least in the Tannaitic period, actually must have lasted close to four years. He bases this on the Torah reading for the *ma-amadot*<sup>118</sup>, which is specified in early sources to be Genesis 1:1-2:3. He assumes that this was originally the first *seder* of the cycle as well (certainly true in later times, but not proven to be so in the Tannaitic period). Since this contains 34 verses, he assumes that this is the average length of a *seder* and determines that it would have taken around 172 weeks to complete the cycle. In this calculation, he assumes that six Shabbatot each year would have had special readings replacing the readings from the cycle as per the Mishnah,<sup>119</sup> increasing the number of Shabbatot required to complete it.<sup>120</sup>

In fact, following the Mishnah, there would have been *more* interruptions to the cycle: the four special Shabbatot starting around Adar, one or two days of Hanukkah, one or two days of Sukkot/Sh'mini Atzeret, one or two days of Pesah, two or three days of Rosh Hodesh, and poten-

---

<sup>117</sup> Wacholder, XII-XIII.

<sup>118</sup> See footnote 30 above.

<sup>119</sup> See footnote 14 above.

<sup>120</sup> Wacholder, XXI-XXII.



tially other Festivals coinciding with Shabbat, for a minimum of eight weeks of interruption (and often more). That would draw out the cycle even longer than his calculation; however, his calculation assumes a 34 verse average, that the cycle was in fact interrupted on all of those occasions (which is certainly not the case in later Babylonian Torah-reading practice, and which could drop the interruptions to as few as seven in a cycle), nor that a three-year cycle with two leap years would be about 161 Shabbatot total.

Wacholder also addresses the question of the *baraita* regarding reading the curses at fixed times of the year. While Mann suggested that this was an invention of the Bavli and not an authentic product of the Tannaitic period in Eretz Yisrael, Wacholder suggests that this *baraita* which matches the Annual Cycle might be evidence that the Annual Cycle also originated in Eretz Yisrael, and not in Babylonia. He supports this assertion by pointing out that the majority of the breaks for *parashiyyot* in the Annual Cycle match those of *s'darim* in the Sequential Triennial Cycle (43 out of 54), suggesting a common place and time of origin. He does not, however, make any attempt to explain how the *baraita*, which attributes this fixing of the cycle to Ezra, could have been reconciled with the Sequential Triennial Cycle.<sup>121</sup>

He further tries to explain why there are eleven *parashiyyot* that start in different places from *s'darim* by suggesting that perhaps all *parashiyyot* originally coincided with a *seder*. Over the course of time, one cycle or the other moved their starting points, and thus our relatively late record of the divisions has mismatches between the two cycles. He points out a particular example of the *parashah* of Vay'hi (Genesis 47:28) in the Annual Cycle, which unusually does not start at the beginning of a paragraph and has no indication of a break in the relatively early Midrashic text B'reishit Rabbah (at least in its earliest known form); however, this break *is* indicated in later Midrashic texts such as the Tanḥuma. It is Wacholder's assertion that this break moved

---

<sup>121</sup> Wacholder, XXII=XXIII.

from an original location coinciding with a *seder* and paragraph break at Genesis 48:1 to the earlier location in order to start on a more positive note.<sup>122</sup>

This theory, however, ignores the possibility that the difference in the Midrashic texts is purely the result of B'reishit Rabbah originating from a location where the Sequential Triennial Cycle was practiced and the Tanḥuma in a place where the Annual Cycle was practiced. This is even further complicated by the fact that both texts show evidence of *midrashim* that were composed in connection with the Sequential Triennial Cycle, and later re-edited based the Annual Cycle.<sup>123</sup>

Wacholder's theory of the relationship of the various Midrashic texts to the Sequential Triennial Cycle and each other is far more developed than Mann's. He first notes that the Tannaïtic *midrash* texts of the Mekhilta d'Rabbi Yishmael, the Sifra, and the Sifra all show evidence of originally being divided according the *s'darim* of the Sequential Triennial Cycle, but having been later re-edited. He divides the Amoraic *midrash* texts into three time periods.<sup>124</sup>

The early time period is represented by B'reishit Rabbah, containing *midrashim* on most of the content of the book of Genesis, but *p'tiḥtot* were written especially on the first verse (or occasionally second or third) of a paragraph. Slightly less than half the chapters coincided with known *seder* breaks. Since it is difficult to say how applicable the lists of *s'darim* we have from later periods were to the early Amoraic period, it is possible that some of the remaining *p'tiḥtot* represented *s'darim* in use during that time, but not the later period or variant practices. The middle time period is represented by Vayyikra Rabbah and P'sikta d'Rav Kahanah, which focus exclusively on the opening verses of paragraphs. Again, slightly less than half of the chapters coincided with known *seder* breaks, and the same general observations can be applied.<sup>125</sup> It seems unlikely that all the *p'tiḥtot*/chapters represented *seder* breaks used in one place or time or

---

<sup>122</sup> Wacholder, XXVII-XXIX.

<sup>123</sup> Mann, I, 6; Wacholder, XXXVIII.

<sup>124</sup> Wacholder, XXXIV-XXXV.

<sup>125</sup> Wacholder, XXXV-XXXVII.

another, based on the sheer number present, and any relationship between *seder* breaks and *p'tiḥtot* may in fact be more due to the desire to place both at paragraph breaks in the text.

The late time period is represented by the Tanḥuma works, which include Sh'mot Rabbah and D'varim Rabbah, as well as both versions of the Tanḥuma. These contain *midrashim* almost exclusively built around *seder* breaks and not general paragraph breaks like the previously mentioned texts. The places where the *midrashim* begin, but we have no *seder* breaks, are in fact likely to have been variant locations for breaks unrecorded elsewhere. These texts include, but are not exclusively made up of Y'lamm'deinu *p'tiḥtot*.<sup>126</sup>

Despite the relationship between the *s'darim* and the Midrashic texts, Wacholder writes that regarding the *midrashim* being composed with an awareness of specific associated *haftarot*, "Although the issue should not be regarded as closed, present evidence does not seem to support such a conclusion."<sup>127</sup> This puts him very much at odds with much of Mann's work which assumes such a relationship, and seeks out the connections by way of verbal tallying. For Wacholder, the links between the *haftarot* and *midrashim* could entirely be the product of a similar process of looking for connecting texts. He also notes that it is possible that the *haftarot* were selected based on the *midrashim*.<sup>128</sup>

The one exception that Wacholder is willing to make to his dissociation of the *haftarot* and *midrashim* is with regard to the Tanḥuma texts. Here he has "no doubt" that some of the *p'tiḥtot* are indeed based on the *haftarot* associated with the *s'darim* for which the *p'tiḥtot* were written. He particularly calls out the Y'lamm'deinu type *p'tiḥtot* as examples of this. He is not, however, willing to say that all the Tanḥuma *midrashim* were constructed in this way, and suggests that these *midrashim* originate from a time when the *haftarot* were only beginning to be standardized.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Wacholder, XXXVIII.

<sup>127</sup> Wacholder, XXXVIII.

<sup>128</sup> Wacholder, XXXVIII-XXXIX.

<sup>129</sup> Wacholder, XXXIX.

Wacholder's theory on the development of the Sequential Triennial Cycle can be summed up as follows: in the Tannaitic period, paragraphs were the primary unit for Torah readings. The *s'darim* were standardized in the early Amoraic period, and the *haftarot* began to be standardized in the late Amoraic period and the following century. He believed that their eventual near-universal consistency was a result of the popularity of Yannai's *piyyutim*, standardizing around the *haftarah* selections represented in them.<sup>130</sup>

One of Wacholder's most important contributions to the study of the Sequential Triennial Cycle was his table of *s'darim* and *haftarot* that summed up all knowledge of these to date.<sup>131</sup> The table included some information as to his sources<sup>132</sup> and provided multiple *haftarot* for a few *s'darim*. He seemingly lacked explicit sources for a group of *haftarot* corresponding to *s'darim* near the end of Leviticus as well as large portions of Numbers and Deuteronomy. A comparison against the data compiled above (which includes *g'nizah* fragments that Wacholder did not have) shows that a little more than half of the *haftarot* that he attributes only to "scholarly speculation" and/or "unknown" turned out to match the *g'nizah* evidence, while the *g'nizah* evidence calls the remainder of these *haftarot* into question. This analysis ignores the *haftarot* for supposed *s'darim* that appear in Wacholder's table, but that do not appear in the *g'nizah* documents at all. The analysis demonstrates that the methods underlying Wacholder's guesswork had a reasonable basis, but by no means produced authoritative results.

The 1972 edition of Elbogen's *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* included updates on the Torah reading section written by Joseph Heinemann. In these additional notes, he presents a summary of how he and other scholars understood the Sequential Triennial Cycle in this time period, including in his summary some of the theories he previously published.<sup>133</sup> He asserts that the cycle lasted a little less than three and a half years and was neither fixed to the cal-

---

<sup>130</sup> Wacholder, XLI-XLII.

<sup>131</sup> Wacholder, LII-LXVII.

<sup>132</sup> Though somewhat generalized at times, like "Genizah fragments" or "Scholarly speculation."

<sup>133</sup> Joseph Heinemann, "The 'Triennial' Cycle and the Calendar", *Tarbiz*, Jun. 1964: 362-368.

endar, nor to the *sh'mittah* year cycle. He indicates that Elbogen's notion of two cycles separate systems, one of three years and one of three and a half appeared to be incorrect. His bases this primarily on the appearance of both *tal* and *geshem* references in adjacent Yannai *piyyutim* and the number of *s'darim* reported in the cycle.<sup>134</sup>

He states that 154 *s'darim* is greater than the average number of Shabbatot in three years. This is indeed true, but the cycle was not necessarily designed to fit the average. If one assumes the cycle was indeed interrupted on all occasions mentioned in the Mishnah including the four special Shabbatot, then it is certainly impossible altogether to fit 154 *s'darim* into three calendar years. Interrupting the cycle on only the occasions for interrupting the Annual Cycle (as it is practiced today), it is not only possible to have 154 *s'darim* in a three calendar year cycle, but that is *exactly* the maximal number of Shabbatot available for normal *s'darim* to be read (in Eretz Yisrael where there is no Yom Tov Sheni).

His historical perspective is similar to Wacholder's. He states that during the Tannaitic period, there was no standardized set of *s'darim* in use. His basis for this seems to be the *baraita* regarding the four special Shabbatot being read on weeks adjacent to the weeks the same part of the Torah is read in the normal cycle.<sup>135</sup> This does not hold up well, as a cycle that is not tied to a round number of calendar years, whether fixed in length or not, could also create this scenario, and such a cycle could certainly have standardized *s'darim*.

Heinemann does not include all of his previous speculation in his notes in Elbogen, however. In his 1964 article, he also theorizes that the break points we have for *s'darim* were the beginning points, but that the reading would normally continue partly into the following *seder*, and the congregation would return to the starting verse for the next *seder* the following week. This explains the problem of how short *s'darim* were read by seven readers, as well as why a number

---

<sup>134</sup> Elbogen, 134.

<sup>135</sup> Elbogen, 134.

of *s'darim* do not end on a positive note when one was available nearby. He bases this on “many sources” that allow one to continue into the next *seder* to complete 21 verses.<sup>136</sup>

We have seen that Massekhet Sofrim does seem to say something along these lines; however, we saw in the Bavli the statement that extending a reading into the next paragraph was only used when there was “room to continue,” and it is arguable whether there is “room to continue” at the end of a *seder*. (It could be that this principle only applied to reading for special days, but that seems inconsistent.) Additionally, the theory seems to completely disregard the Bavli’s statement that the *halakhah* is that where we stop on one Shabbat we begin on the next. It would require reinterpreting it to mean that the verse “where we stop” is read on both weeks (and often this would require at least two additional verses to be read on both weeks, given that *seder* breaks are often at paragraph breaks). This interpretation is certainly not borne out by the Annual Cycle practice, and seems somewhat unlikely.

In 1987, Rabbi Lionel Moses presented a paper to the Conservative Movement’s Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, proposing a revival of the Sequential Triennial Cycle in response to questions regarding implementing a triennial cycle of Torah reading that had been raised over the last several decades.<sup>137</sup> In fact, the desire in modern times to shorten the weekly Torah reading by using a triennial system can be traced as far back as 1840’s Germany. The early Reformers’ initial move in this direction was to try to revive the Sequential Triennial Cycle as evidenced by a system of 154 *s'darim* in the 1841 Hamburg Temple prayerbook. Many of these *s'darim* match with those of the Masoretic texts, but there are also many that do not.<sup>138</sup> The problem of *haftarah* selections was irrelevant to them, as they had already eliminated that institution in the Hamburg Temple.

---

<sup>136</sup> Heinemann, 368.

<sup>137</sup> Lionel Moses, “Is there an Authentic Triennial Cycle of Torah Readings?”, *Proceedings of the Committee on Jewish Law and Standard of the Conservative Movement 1986-1990*, Hoboken: G & H Soho, 2001, 331-332.

<sup>138</sup> Salomon, Gotthold, et. al. ed., *Gebetbuch für die öffentliche und häusliche Andacht der Israeliten nach dem Gebrauch des neuen israelitischen Tempels in Hamburg*, Hamburg: B. S. Berendsohn, 1845, 431-433.

During the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, some Reform congregations began adopting a new “triennial cycle,” which was, in fact, a modified Annual Cycle, where only part of each *parashah* was read each Shabbat morning. Further variations included: reading the intervening two thirds on Shabbat afternoon, Monday, and Thursday (in accordance with the anonymous opinion of the Tosefta<sup>139</sup>) and reading the beginning of the *parashah* every year of the cycle and then skipping to the third of the *parashah* being read in that year (with no halakhic precedent at all).<sup>140</sup>

While Reform congregations, particularly those in America, began moving towards reading only excerpts of the *parashah*, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a number of Conservative congregations were using these three variant methods for abbreviating Torah readings which seem to have their origin in the Reform practice. Moses notes that the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards was asked in 1961 about “the Triennial Cycle,” and Rabbi Jules Harlow responded for the Law Committee that it was permitted after “careful consideration” and that there was no pattern as to how a triennial cycle was implemented among Conservative congregations. Harlow also noted the existence of the non-triennial, but still alternative, practice of reading the entire *parashah* over the course of the four Torah readings of the week instead of on Shabbat morning alone.<sup>141</sup>

The Law Committee answered several questions on “the triennial cycle” over the next two decades, but during that time was not willing to define how such a cycle was to be performed or provide any information on a sequential cycle.<sup>142</sup> It was not until Moses’s paper, that the Law Committee made any attempt to define the parameters of a valid “triennial cycle” (or other alternative reading system).

Moses spends a significant amount of his paper summing up the scholarship and knowledge of the Sequential Triennial Cycle to date, and the unanswered questions regarding it. In doing so, he made much of this information available in a single place for the first time, par-

---

<sup>139</sup> This is attributed to Rabbi Meir in Talmud Bavli Megillah 31b.

<sup>140</sup> Elbogen, 133.

<sup>141</sup> Moses, 332.

<sup>142</sup> Moses, 333.

ticularly for the English reader. With his goal being to revive the cycle, Moses also draws from the *halakhic* sources, both in establishing the parameters for the system, and in evaluating other alternative methods of reading the Torah. In particular, he stresses the Talmudic statement that we do not skip in the Torah “So that Israel will hear the Torah in order.”<sup>143</sup> In its original context, this is about skipping during the Torah reading of a given day, but Moses uses the underlying concept to add weight to the importance of a sequential cycle.<sup>144</sup> Moses points out the advantages of the Sequential Triennial Cycle over other forms of abbreviating the Torah reading: historical authenticity, *haftarot* that match the Torah text being read, and the opportunity to incorporate *midrashim* and *piyyutim* based on the Sequential Triennial Cycle into the service and give them new life as well.<sup>145</sup>

Moses then embarks on a study of how the *halakhic* parameters might be applied to the text in light of the historical record of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He notes that the Bomberg Bible list of *s'darim* includes eleven that are less than 21 verses, and provides a helpful table showing the lengths of all the *s'darim*. He also points out that 21 verses is still insufficient when there are paragraphs of four or five verses that must be read by one reader, and provides another table for these, showing that there are six additional *s'darim* that lack sufficient verses for seven readers. He considers the *halakhic* options for dealing with all of these short *s'darim* to be: repetition within the week's reading, merging the short *s'darim* with adjacent ones, or reading beyond the end of the *seder*, but returning to the beginning of the following *seder* the next week (as per Heinemann's theory). He rejects the third option on the basis of the Talmud's explicit ruling that where the reading ends one week it must be begun the following week.<sup>146</sup>

Moses then brings in the question of beginning and ending each *aliyah* on a positive note. He observes that the *minhag* of doing so may have come about after the institution of the Se-

---

<sup>143</sup> Talmud Y'rushalmi Meg, 4:5 75b.

<sup>144</sup> Moses, 340-341.

<sup>145</sup> Moses, 344.

<sup>146</sup> Moses, 345-348, 379-380.



quential Triennial Cycle, and therefore not be applicable, but nevertheless spends considerable effort in an analysis of the possible locations for breaks that conform to this practice. He first analyzes the *seder* breaks themselves, determining that nine *s'darim* begin on a negative note and 20 end on a negative note. Of these, four and five respectively are also ending points for *aliyot* in what have become the standard divisions of the Annual Cycle. Thus both cycles are already known to occasionally begin or end on a negative note in the accepted traditions. The increased number of endings on a negative note in the Sequential Triennial Cycle is perhaps not surprising given that a smaller section would have fewer possibilities to choose from and it seems that priority was given to starting a week's reading on a positive note. He concludes that *aliyah* breaks should ideally start and end on a positive note, but beginning on a good note should be given priority over than ending on one. He points out that in many cases either may be impossible to achieve, especially with the shorter *s'darim* (and there is precedent for allowing it where necessary).<sup>147</sup>

Moses notes, based on his *halakhic* analysis, that the practice of reading the *parashah* over the course of the week's four Torah readings (which he calls the Modified Annual Cycle) is in keeping with the minority opinion of the Tosefta. Based on how the Conservative Movement approaches *halakhah*, he concludes that this should therefore be a permitted option for Conservative synagogues. On the other hand, he rules against the practice of reading the beginning of the *parashah* every year and then skipping to different parts of the *parashah* in different years. He notes that this violates the *halakhah* that one may not skip in the Torah. He also rules against the system in which a third of the *parashah* is read in each of three years, skipping two-thirds from week to week (called by Moses the Modified Triennial Cycle). He is not completely clear about the reasons for this, referencing the need to teach the Torah in an orderly manner and the fragmentation of the narrative, but does not mention at this point the reason he states elsewhere, that the Talmud rules that the reading must begin one week where it leaves off the previous week.

---

<sup>147</sup> Moses, 349-350.

Thus he concludes that only the Sequential Triennial Cycle and “Modified Annual Cycle” are acceptable ways to read the Torah in such a way as to reduce the amount of time required from that of the Annual Cycle.<sup>148</sup>

He goes on to address the question of the *haftarot* for the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He summarizes what was known at that time, criticizing Mann’s rigidity in assuming that all *haftarot* were ten verses (more or less). He leaves the question of *haftarot* open, indicating that more research is necessary, but affirming the importance of not deviating from the textual evidence in determining the length of *haftarot* or skipping therein.<sup>149</sup>

Finally, Moses addresses the question of how to observe Simḥat Torah in congregations using the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He points out that historically, it was only celebrated on the Shabbat that the Torah was completed, and follows the theory that this was not fixed to the calendar. On the basis of the practice of the two synagogues of Old Cairo celebrating together, however, he says that congregations should still celebrate the second day of Sh’mini Atzeret as a type of Simḥat Torah, reading the end of the Torah and beginning of Joshua, but omitting the reading of Genesis 1. He also indicates that the final Shabbat of the cycle should be celebrated as a Simḥat Torah, incorporating some of the practices that developed in the Annual Cycle.<sup>150</sup>

Moses stops short of providing a practical implementation of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He states that more work is needed to divide the *s’darim* into *aliyot*, to determine all of the *haftarot*, and to develop a calendar for reading the *s’darim* (presumably so that all congregations using the cycle will be reading the same thing, as Moses’s proposal is clearly for a cycle that is not fixed to the calendar).<sup>151</sup> In 1987, Rabbi Elliot Dorff presented a short *t’shuvah* to the Law Committee of the Conservative movement that acknowledged Moses’s work and ruled that the acceptable options for Conservative congregations are: the Annual Cycle, the “Modified An-

---

<sup>148</sup> Moses, 350-352.

<sup>149</sup> Moses, 353-355.

<sup>150</sup> Moses, 355-357.

<sup>151</sup> Moses, 357.

nual Cycle,” the Sequential Triennial Cycle “as delineated by Rabbi Moses”, and the non-sequential “Modified Triennial Cycle” (which Moses rejected).<sup>152</sup>

Dorff’s reasoning for the latter is that the principle of not skipping in the Torah, which Moses stresses several times in his paper, refers to skipping *within* a day’s reading in its original context and not from week to week. While this is certainly the case, Dorff entirely ignores the *actual* halakhic reason why the practice was problematic which Moses also mentions: that the Talmud rules that one must begin one week where one ended the previous week. Dorff seems to have a preference for the non-sequential system, apparently because it allows congregations using it to follow the same reading calendar as congregations reading according to the Annual Cycle. Dorff’s *t’shuvah* was approved by the committee by a vote of seven for it and four against it, with two abstentions.<sup>153</sup>

The following year, Rabbi Richard Eisenberg presented a paper to the Law Committee, with a full implementation of the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle, including all *aliyah* breaks and tables for handling weeks where the Annual Cycle would be reading a double portion. This too was approved by the committee. Oddly, despite the fact that the Dorff *t’shuvah* explicitly called out Moses’s system as a valid option, Eisenberg’s paper describes the previous year’s events, saying “Although [Moses’s] specific recommendation was ultimately not accepted by the Law Committee, Rabbi Moses’s efforts led to a reevaluation of the triennial cycle... An alternative approach was recommended to the Law Committee by Rabbi Elliot Dorff...”<sup>154</sup> It seems that the perception was that the Sequential Triennial Cycle had been rejected and Dorff’s Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle chosen as the definitive cycle of the Conservative movement, despite the fact that the committee had technically approved both options. It certainly did not help mat-

---

<sup>152</sup> Elliot N. Dorff, “Annual and Triennial Systems for Reading the Torah”, *Proceedings of the Committee on Jewish Law and Standard of the Conservative Movement 1986-1990*, Hoboken: G & H Soho, 2001, 327-328.

<sup>153</sup> Dorff, 328.

<sup>154</sup> Richard Eisenberg, “A Complete Triennial System for Reading the Torah”, *Proceedings of the Committee on Jewish Law and Standard of the Conservative Movement 1986-1990*, Hoboken: G & H Soho, 2001, 383.

ters that Eisenberg presented a complete, usable system and Moses did not. Eisenberg's system, with minor amendments, did indeed become the standard way of practicing a reduced-length Torah reading over the next decades. In fact, today, many Jews are unfamiliar with any other meaning to "Triennial Cycle" and assume that the Dorff/Eisenberg cycle was what was used historically.

Around the same time that the Law Committee was engaged in these discussions, Jacob Offer was working on determining the purpose of the *seder* markings in the Prophets and Writings in the Masoretic text. As a by-product of his research, he produced the most comprehensive list of *s'darim* and *haftarot* yet, based purely on *g'nizah* texts and without including the kind of speculation that Wacholder and Mann used.<sup>155</sup> He published this list in his 1989 article on the Masoretic *s'darim*, and it remains invaluable in the study of the Sequential Triennial Cycle to this day.<sup>156</sup>

In 1994, the matter of the implementing of the Triennial Cycle was addressed by Israel's Masorti Movement (the equivalent there to the American Conservative Movement). As in America, there was a desire to reduce the length of the Torah reading, and it seems that some congregations were adopting the Dorff/Eisenberg Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle. Rabbi David Lazar wrote a *t'shuvah* on the subject for the Va'ad Halakhah that reviewed the history of the Sequential Triennial Cycle and modern attempts at creating abbreviated reading systems.

Of note, Lazar tries to address the problem of the Bavli's *baraita* on reciting the passages of the curses at specific times of year. He mentions the possibility that the Sequential Triennial Cycle did indeed read these curses at that proper times, but as interruptions to the regular cycle,

---

<sup>155</sup> Offer, 176-185.

<sup>156</sup> The list compiled for this paper was compiled independently from Offer's work. A comparison against it reveals that he included a few short *g'nizah* fragments that I did not come across, but these mainly reaffirmed information already available elsewhere; however, I apparently had access to additional, more significant *g'nizah* fragments that he did not have and was also able to identify a few more verses here and there on the shared fragments, allowing the list in this paper to be more complete.

as practiced on other special Shabbatot, but he rejects this solution on the basis that had such special Shabbatot exists, we would have testimony regarding them in the available sources. We have Midrashic texts, *piyyut* cycles, and *haftarah* lists for the Sequential Triennial Cycle that reference the readings for all the special Shabbatot and holidays, and none of them has any reference to these two occasions among the special days. This is a strong argument against reconciling the *baraita* with what is known of the historical Sequential Triennial Cycle in this way. This leads Lazar to the conclusion that both historical cycles originated in Eretz Yisrael and were practiced there simultaneously: the Annual Cycle, fixed to the calendar; and another cycle which was read week-by-week until the entire Torah was completed.<sup>157</sup> Also of interest is Lazar's mention of Menahem ben Yashar, an Orthodox professor, who 30 years prior, called for the public to adopt the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Though nothing came of it, it demonstrates the value of a usable halakhic Sequential Triennial Cycle across all segments of Judaism.<sup>158</sup>

In the end, Lazar rules that the only permissible way to shorten the reading is via the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He rejects both the American non-sequential cycle, and the system based on the Tosefta that involves reading an entire *parashah* over the course of the week's four Torah readings - both of which *had* been accepted by the American Law Committee. He supports a version of the Sequential Triennial Cycle that would begin and end on Sh'mini Atzeret like the Annual Cycle, and thus lasts exactly three years. His basis for this is that the public is now used to a Simhat Torah on that day, that the historical record seems to indicate a variety of different practices for the cycle, and that such a cycle meets all halakhic requirements.<sup>159</sup>

The *t'shuvah* was approved by a majority of four of the seven rabbis on the committee. Two of those opposed were in favor of the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle used in America over any historical Sequential Triennial Cycle (presumably, the third was opposed to anything other

---

<sup>157</sup> David Lazar, "תשובה בענין המחזור התלת-שנתי של קריאת התורה," כרך 1, *תשובות ועד ההלכה* - Rabbinical Assembly of Israel – the Movement for Masorti Judaism in Israel: 1995: 104-105.

<sup>158</sup> Lazar, 108-109.

<sup>159</sup> Lazar, 109-110.

than the Annual Cycle). These two rabbis claimed that the Tannaitic and Amoraic passages regarding starting where the previous week ended were written in a time and place where the Sequential Triennial Cycle was practiced, and so they were discussing that system in particular. Thus, the authors of the dissenting opinion argued, those passages were not directly related to the question of reading only a third of the Annual Cycle *parashah*, and consequently there was no *halakhah* opposed to such a practice.<sup>160</sup> Their understanding of the passages as referring only to the Sequential Triennial Cycle is odd, as there is no place that it explicitly says this. It remains an open question whether the Annual Cycle also originated in Eretz Yisrael and is evidenced by the *baraita* of the reading of the curses. The final halakhic determination on this matter is also made in the Bavli with no further discussion, and the rabbis of that time and place were certainly familiar with and using the Annual Cycle. Additionally, regardless of the system employed, the halakhic ruling to start one week where the previous one ended seems to be clear cut and not limited to any reading system.

The dissenters also suggest that the Tannaitic practice to read different sections over the course of the week indicates that even in the Tannaitic period there was a desire to shorten the already-short weekly section. They do not, however, consider that it is possible and even likely that there *was* no fixed weekly section at that time, and the reading was simply continuous (i.e. nothing was shortened). Their additional arguments were: that skipping from week to week would only have been problematic in a time before printed books when people might not have had the context available, that the *parashah* of the week for the Annual Cycle is well known to the Israeli public, that the non-sequential system allows more time for learning, that it is an established *minhag* in America and *minhag* nullifies *halakhah*, and that a new practice is allowed if

---

<sup>160</sup> Michael Graetz and Rabbi Gilah Dror, “הסתייגות לתשובה בענין המחזור התלת-שנתי של קריאת התורה,” *תשובות ועד ההלכה* 7, Rabbinical Assembly of Israel – the Movement for Masorti Judaism in Israel: 1995: 185-187.

it improves the performance of the *mitzvah* (in this case by increasing time for learning).<sup>161</sup> Each of these arguments also has fairly obvious weaknesses.

Though a full system for the modern implementation of the Sequential Triennial Cycle was never created in America, in Israel, Rabbi Simchah Roth did create a full system that could be used by Masorti synagogues. The Roth system includes 155 *s'darim* to be read over the course of exactly three years on 154 Shabbatot, with the final *seder* read on Sh'mini Atzeret/Simḥat Torah. The cycle is interrupted only on the same occasions as the Annual Cycle: Yom Tov and Ḥol Ha-moed. Also similar to the Annual Cycle, on some weeks, two *s'darim* are read, as necessitated by the number of Shabbatot in the three year cycle that do not coincide with Festivals.<sup>162</sup>

The *haftarot* are drawn from the historical record wherever possible, based on Mann's work, and therefore follow his faulty assumption that *haftarot* for the Sequential Triennial Cycle were always in the vicinity of ten verses. He leaves open the possibility of replacing these *haftarot* in the future with selections that are more accessible to the modern reader. He also provides a breakdown of *aliyah* breaks for all 155 *s'darim*. Avoiding starting and ending an *aliyah* on a note that was negative for the Israelite people was considered in the division process, but was not always possible, but this is true, to a degree, in the Annual Cycle divisions as well. He solves the problem of short *s'darim* by shifting the starting points of those *s'darim* to effectively create new ones. In the process, he also creates new *haftarot* that verbally tally with the opening verses, in keeping with the practice of the historical cycle.<sup>163</sup>

He chooses the solution of changing the *seder* divisions only after eliminating the other possibilities. He rejects adding verses from the following *seder* and then returning to its beginning the following week because of the *halakhah* of starting on one Shabbat morning where the

---

<sup>161</sup> Graetz, 186-187.

<sup>162</sup> Simchah Roth, "תשובה בענין המחזור התלת-שנתי של קריאת התורה," *תשובות ועד ההלכה - כרך ו'*, Rabbinical Assembly of Israel – the Movement for Masorti Judaism in Israel: 1995: 119-121.

<sup>163</sup> Roth, 126-129.

previous one ended. Repeating verses in different *aliyot* would sometimes require repeating the same verses three times, and some *s'darim* cannot comply with a *halakhic* requirement to add three new verses to each *aliyah*, or at least two if there is no other option. This is even more problematic with regard to repeating whole *aliyot*. Treating half-verses as if they are full verses is also halakhically problematic even though there is a Talmudic precedent. He cites Mann, who, from his methods of extracting *seder* breaks from Midrashic texts, concluded that historically the *seder* breaks have shifted.<sup>164</sup>

Roth must also address the problematic *baraita* of the timing of the readings of the curses on the calendar being established by Ezra. He notes that this is not listed in the iteration of Ezra's rulings in the Y'rushalmi, and attributes it to an artificial attempt by the Babylonian rabbis to lend weight to the Babylonian practice of reading over the course of one year beginning and ending in Tishrei. Thus, in his opinion, it applies only to the Annual Cycle and can be disregarded with regard to the Sequential Triennial Cycle. In his system, both sets of curses are read before Rosh Hashanah (at the end of the second and third years of the cycle). He also offers the suggestion that congregations could take out a second Torah on the weeks the curses are recited in the Annual Cycle and read the curses in order to comply with the *baraita*. He notes that this is problematic in its lengthening of the reading, creating a situation where the *haftarah* would be tied to the first reading and not the "special" one, and the possibility that two sets of curses could be read on the same day.<sup>165</sup> He does not mention the additional point that this practice would lack historical accuracy since we have lists of the special Shabbatot for the Sequential Triennial Cycle in *g'nizah* fragments and implied by *piyyut* cycles and *midrash* collections, and none of them shows any evidence of the two sets of curses being among the special Shabbatot.

With regard to weeks where Shabbat coincides with Festivals and to other special Shabbatot, Roth only mentions that they will have the familiar special *haftarot*. He does not bring up

---

<sup>164</sup> Roth, 123-126.

<sup>165</sup> Roth, 134.



the concern that more special Shabbatot may have interrupted the Sequential Triennial Cycle at one point in its history. He mentions that there is no guarantee that the *haftarot* we are familiar with for these occasions were the original ones used in the Sequential Triennial Cycle, and indeed, though he does not mention it, the evidence we have suggests that some of them are not what was used originally. Nevertheless, he rules that the ones that have become traditional in the Annual Cycle may be used, as they meet the *halakhic* requirements and they preserve the present practice. He also provides a list of these *haftarot*, showing how they may be shortened using Mann's rules of ten verses and skipping to a positive ending.<sup>166</sup>

Roth's *t'shuvah* succeeds in assembling the first complete Sequential Triennial Cycle of the modern period. It does so by adopting some conventions of the Annual Cycle that are not (or at least likely are not) strictly historically accurate, but the system is able to comply with all halakhic requirements while maintaining a strong connection to the historical readings. In some places, the divisions and *haftarot* rely too heavily on Mann's assumptions and speculation, and thus do not reflect the historical record as well as if these had been constructed based directly on evidence from *g'nizah* documents.

Scholarship on the Sequential Triennial Cycle continued over the next couple of decades. In 1998, Shlomo Naeh put forth a new theory on the relationship of the Sequential Triennial Cycle to the calendar. He argued for a "Septennial Cycle" consisting of two complete iterations of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. In this theory, the cycle would begin after Sukkot, and the rest of first cycle would not be fixed to the calendar at all. The second cycle, picking up whenever the first one finished, *would*, however, be fixed to the calendar in two places: the reading of the curses in Leviticus before Shavuot in the sixth year and the conclusion prior to Sukkot in the seventh year. This solves the problem of the *baraita* regarding the timing of the curses which was attributed to the authority of Ezra. It also allows for the cycle to be *both* fixed to the calendar and not fixed, accommodating the arguments for both possibilities. So, for instance, it is possible for

---

<sup>166</sup> Roth, 134-135.

three out of the four special Shabbat readings around Adar to be adjacent to the week the same text is read in the regular cycle. The seven year cycle, of course, neatly ties into the *sh'mitah* cycle and Deuteronomy's commandment to recite "this teaching" every seventh year on Sukkot.<sup>167</sup>

He also explains the three different counts of *s'darim* found in the Masoretic sources: 141, 154, and 167. He points out that two cycles of 154 are equal to one of 167 and one of 141, and these might represent two different ways of executing the "Septennial Cycle." The key is that it is very difficult to compute in advance the number of *s'darim* that need to be doubled over a seven year period to fit the cycle to the calendar. This would have been even more problematic in the Tannaitic and early Amoraic periods prior to the fixing of the calendar. Thus, Naeh suggests that some place reduced the first cycle to 141 *s'darim*, and as the end of the seven years drew closer, they were in a better position to determine how many of the remaining *s'darim* needed to be combined. The second cycle could therefore have a maximum of 167 or a minimum of 154 *s'darim*. The key point for this adjustment would be the Shavuot of the sixth year; by fixing this to the *seder* of the curses, there were both 65 *s'darim* left and a maximum of 65 Shabbatot before the end of the cycle and doublings could be used as their need became apparent.<sup>168</sup>

In order to arrive at these numbers, he calculates the minimum and maximum number of interruptions to the cycle there could be in a single year, assuming that all the occasions mentioned in Mishnah Megillah would have interrupted the cycle. He determines that there can be between eight and twelve Shabbatot (inclusively) each year on which the normal *s'darim* would not be read. For a seven year minimum, he assumes the minimum of two leap years out of seven and 56 (8 x 7) Shabbatot that would be unavailable for a total of 140-142 available weeks in the cycle. Similarly for the maximum, he assumes the maximum of three leap years and 84 unavailable Shabbatot for a total of 154-156 weeks. He notes that these are effectively the *seder* counts

---

<sup>167</sup> Shlomo Naeh, "The Torah Reading in Early Palestine: A Re-Examination," *Tarbiz*, Jan. 1998: 177-180.

<sup>168</sup> "A Re-Examination," 176, 180.

found in the Masoretic texts.<sup>169</sup> The flaw in these calculations is that there would never, in fact, be seven years in a row with the maximum or minimum number of interruptions, and so his minimum is an underestimate and his maximum would be an overestimate, and, while the actual possible counts of available weeks would vary from cycle to cycle, they would never actually fall into the ranges that match the *seder* counts. This works even less well if the cycle was not in fact interrupted on all occasions mentioned in the Mishnah.

There are several other weaknesses to this theory. If most of the *seder* doubling occurred towards the end of the cycle, one would expect to find more short *s'darim* towards the end of the cycle (and perhaps approaching the curses in Leviticus) than towards its beginning, but this is not the case. We know from the historical record that Simḥat Torah in Old Cairo was not celebrated by both congregations at the same time; if the Sequential Triennial Cycle was completed around Sukkot on every other cycle, it seems like in the very least the descriptions would be worded differently. While we have multiple sources for 154 and 167 *s'darim*, there is only a single source for 141 *s'darim* and it could have emerged as the result of scribal errors and/or ignorance of the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Finally, if the system was designed so that some *s'darim* would be combined in some cycles, but not others, as needed, one would expect to find texts that have all the *s'darim* marked, but some indication of which ones to combine as needed (particularly in Deuteronomy); however, all the complete lists that we have mark either 154 or 167 *s'darim* with no differentiation of different types. Similarly, while lack of evidence is hardly conclusive, one might expect that if portions needed to be combined in order to fit the calendar, that there would have been documents mapping the *s'darim* to the calendar for a given cycle,

In 2003, Ezra Fleischer published an article which, in many ways, was a response to Naeh's theory, but also contributed some new information and theories of his own. He cites two *piyyutim*, which he determines are from authors in Old Cairo and Jerusalem which both contain poetic references that say that the number of *s'darim* in the Torah is 137. This is yet another

---

<sup>169</sup> "A Re-examination," 174-176.

count for the number of *s'darim* that was not previously known and is not accounted for in Naeh's theory.<sup>170</sup>

Fleischer also points out that the actual listings of *s'darim* that we have, though differing in their counts, are remarkably similar, with mostly additions and removals from each other's iterations, and very few other variations. He suggests that this may indicate that there was an original list of *s'darim* in an early period from which each of the varying lists (full or partial) known to us today branched off.<sup>171</sup>

Like Heinemann before him, Fleischer also suggests that the *s'darim* actually spilled over into the beginning of the following *seder*. One of the considerations for this theory is the fact that neither any of the lists of *s'darim* nor any of the *piyyutim* referencing *s'darim* actually explicitly specifies the ending verses. This is weak evidence since if a *seder* always ended immediately before the starting verse for the next *seder*, specifying them explicitly would have been unnecessary.

Also, while this theory resolves the problems of short *s'darim* and ending on a negative note, it does so at the cost of disregarding the *baraita*, Talmudic discussion, and Talmudic ruling that one must begin where one left off the previous week. Fleischer addresses this only by pointing out that the discussion with the final ruling only appears in the Bavli and not the Y'rushalmi, and so, he claims, in Eretz Yisrael, it was never in effect. He also points out that (according to his own theory), the original list of *s'darim* from which all others branched out originated before the Mishnah was finalized, and therefore the Sequential Triennial Cycle could have followed a precedent that differed.<sup>172</sup> These conclusions disregard the *baraita*, which presents two opinions, neither of the which would seem to permit repeating verses, and he also gives no consideration to the thought that once the *halakhah* had been standardized, the Sequential Triennial Cycle was

---

<sup>170</sup> Ezra Fleischer, "Remarks Concerning the Triennial Cycle of the Torah Reading in Eretz Israel," *Tarbiz*, Oct. 2003: 85-89.

<sup>171</sup> Fleischer, 90-91.

<sup>172</sup> Fleischer, 93.

still practiced for many centuries in and out of Eretz Yisrael,. In those later periods, at least, there would likely have been the expectation that the reading would comply with this *halakhah* (not to mention that it seems likely the verses to repeat would have been indicated in documents from those times and places). The fact that there is not even any recorded debate about this matter casts some suspicion on the theory.

Fleischer points to a group of *piyyutim* containing references to the first words of the *s'darim* for the Shabbat mornings for which they were written as an indication that people commonly knew the *s'darim* by their first few significant words, similarly to how in the Annual Cycle today, the *parashiyyot* are known by their first one or two significant words.<sup>173</sup> He makes a couple of interesting points based on the listings of Torah readings for special occasions that we have from *g'nizah* fragments. Firstly, he points out that some of the documents indicate additional special Shabbatot during the month of Nissan, pointing to special readings both for the Torah and the *haftarah* for those weeks. He assumes that the weekly cycle would be interrupted by these (and this they would throw off Naeh's calculations).<sup>174</sup>

He also notes that comparing the lists for special occasions to the lists of *s'darim* in the cycle, the weekly readings almost never begin on the same verse as those for special occasions. He suggests that this is by design, so that when referring to a section by the first phrase, there is no question about whether it is a weekly reading or a special reading. This is particularly important for the Sequential Triennial Cycle since a special reading could theoretically occur on the same week or an adjacent week which contained overlap in the material read. Fleischer suggests that originally the *s'darim* coincided with the special readings exactly, but as the readings became fixed, the *s'darim* were shifted so they no longer coincided precisely. He cites as evidence the *baraita* from the Tosefta about cases of the same reading occurring two weeks in a row, and concludes that by moving the *seder* locations, the aesthetic problem with the *baraita*'s ruling that

---

<sup>173</sup> Fleischer, 92-93.

<sup>174</sup> Fleischer, 99-100.

the reading is in fact repeated was elegantly eliminated.<sup>175</sup> It is not, however, clear, that the Tosefta was referring to a case of the entire Torah reading being exactly the same two weeks in a row; it instead could simply be referring to the overlap in the two readings, in which case it would have no bearing on this theoretical change of *seder* starting verses.

Fleischer looks in particular at the few exceptions in the *seder* lists that would seem to disagree with his theory and begin in exactly the same place as a special reading. Two of these, the *s'darim* at Lev. 23:15 and at Num. 18:25, appear in the lists of *s'darim* in the Bomberg Bible and the Damascus Keter, but not in the longer lists from the Leningrad Codex. These are not, however, cases of the *s'darim* being omitted in a longer list, since the shorter lists have *s'darim* instead at Lev. 23:9 and Num. 19:1. Fleischer concludes that this is evidence of *s'darim* that were moved to avoid collisions with special readings, and that the Leningrad Codex therefore represent an older tradition. This theory does also go some way towards explaining the reasons behind some of the handful of moved *seder* breaks among the lists we have.<sup>176</sup>

He points at other examples of places where starting points for Festival readings and Sequential Triennial Cycle *s'darim* coincide at Exodus 22:24 and Genesis 22:1. With regard to these, he notes that the special readings in question, the fifth day of Ḥol Hamoed Pesah and the second day of Rosh Hashanah, respectively, are always weekday occasions, and thus would never create the problem of reading the same section on the same or consecutive Shabbat mornings.<sup>177</sup> One remaining problem, for the reading of the birth of Isaac beginning in Genesis 21:1 as both a *seder* (in all known lists) and for the first day of Rosh Hashanah can be explained by the documented record that at least some congregations using the Sequential Triennial Cycle were reading a section from Leviticus instead on Rosh Hashanah, and the lists we have reflect that practice.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Fleischer, 95-96.

<sup>176</sup> Fleischer, 97.

<sup>177</sup> Though it would still allow the same reading within the same week!

<sup>178</sup> Fleischer, 96-99.

The bulk of the rest of Fleischer's article is a refutation of Naeh's Septennial Cycle theory. He points out that Naeh's conclusions about the cycle involve major concepts: the cycle only being fully completed every seven years, that this was in connection with *hakhel* (the commandment in the Torah that implies that it should be read in its entirety on Sukkot of the seventh year), and that special effort and complex calculations had to be made so that all communities would reach the Leviticus curses on the same week in the sixth year. Fleischer questions how likely it is that not a hint of these concepts is mentioned anywhere in either of the Talmuds, or any of the many sources we have from that period forward. Fleischer also points to the fact that many sources specify a cycle of three or three and a half years, but none of seven. He even adds to the well-known sources a poem about the conflict in Old Cairo over the continued use of the Sequential Triennial Cycle during Maimonides' time which mentions "three and a half years."<sup>179</sup> While it is true that all the sources specify three or three and half years for a cycle, this is a weak argument against Naeh's theory, as one cycle through the Torah *is* between three and four years in his theory.

Fleischer also looks at the recorded rituals and *piyyutim* we have in connection with the reading of the final *seder* of the cycle (V'zot Ha-Brakhah, similarly to the Annual Cycle). He notes that none of the sources mention any connection whatsoever to Sukkot, which, according to Naeh's theory, is the time of year that the Torah would have been completed after the second cycle completing seven years. One *k'rovah* indicates explicitly to mention *tal* or *geshem* as appropriate (providing the language for both), showing that it was recited in both summer and winter. None of the *piyyutim* reference three or three and half years, let alone seven years. Fleischer sees this all as evidence as a weakness in Naeh's theory: that if the seven year cycle was so important and tied to the Torah's commandment of *hakhel*, there would have been special rituals attached to its completion and poetic references to this. If the rituals and special *piyyutim* documented were only for the end of two cycles around Sukkot, they would not have language for

---

<sup>179</sup> Fleischer, 104-108.

*geshem* and they would likely mention Sukkot, and if they were the same rituals for both sub-cycles, then there is nothing special about seven years and it is simply two three and a half year cycles. He also notes that there are no references in the *midrashim* known to originate in Eretz Yisrael and written with regard to the final *seder*.<sup>180</sup> Again, Fleischer's arguments are weak in that just because there was no unique ritual for the end of the seven year cycle (as compared to the end of its first half), it does not mean that there was no seven year cycle (or perhaps there was in an earlier time period, and just not in 12<sup>th</sup> Century Old Cairo). Additionally, there is no reason that a *payy'tan* or the author of a *midrash* would *have* to mention Sukkot or *hakhel* in connection with reading the final *seder*, especially if the *piyyutim* and *midrashim* were to be used at the conclusion of both sub-cycles. Nevertheless, he has a point that the complete silence of the sources for an event seven years in the making decrease the likelihood of Naeh's theory being correct.

Fleischer makes a case that from an early period, the reading cycle was not interrupted when Shabbat coincided with Rosh Hodesh. While, as we have seen, the Mishnah does explicitly indicate that the cycle is interrupted, the parallel *baraita* in the Tosefta, which discusses the case of a *seder* and a special reading falling on consecutive weeks mentions only the four special Shabbat portions beginning around Adar, Hanukkah, and Purim, with no mention of Rosh Hodesh. He also points to a passage in the Y'rushalmi which seems to be talking about a case of Shabbat and Rosh Hodesh coinciding and reading both the normal weekly reading and the special reading for the day: “ראש חודש שחל להיות בשבת א"ר יוסי בי ר' בון שירת הלויים לא” “Rosh Hodesh that falls to be on Shabbat: Rabbi Yosi Bei Rabbi Bun said, ‘The Song of the Levites [must be] not less than six readings; its acronym [for where to begin each] is HZYVLK.”<sup>181</sup> Here, “the Song of the Levites” is poem in Deuteronomy 32 known as “Ha-azinu,” and the acronym still represents the way it is divided among

---

<sup>180</sup> Fleischer, 109-111.

<sup>181</sup> Talmud Y'rushalmi Megillah 3:8 74b.



readers today. Fleischer also brings evidence of this practice from a *k'rovah* for Shabbat Rosh Hodesh that dates to shortly after the Amoraic period in Eretz Yisrael, which twice references the reading of both the weekly and Rosh Hodesh readings on the same day. Fleischer proves fairly conclusively that in some places and times the cycle was not interrupted on Rosh Hodesh. It seems clearer that this may have been the case from the Amoraic period onwards, as the *baraita's* lack of mention of Rosh Hodesh is somewhat inconclusive. Fleischer suggests that the *peyy'tan* only mentioned this occurrence because it was exceptional, and so it must have been *only* on Rosh Hodesh and not on other special Shabbatot that this occurred. He then points out that Naeh's calculations regarding the number of regular Shabbatot in his Septennial Cycle would be off by two to three weeks per year due to this practice.<sup>182</sup> While Fleischer makes a good point regarding the Naeh's assumptions and the accuracy of his calculations, his conclusion that *only* Rosh Hodesh had the weekly reading and a special reading on the same day is based on a weak argument, and it seem possible that, as in the Annual Cycle today, this occurred on other special Shabbatot as well.

Fleischer mentions that Naeh responded to this particular criticism of his theory by suggesting that the Septennial Cycle was set up in a very early period where, as the Mishnah indicates, Rosh Hodesh *did* interrupt the cycle. When that changed later, the allocation of *s'darim* to fit the number of weeks available was adjusted accordingly, but the overall number of *s'darim* remained the same as the early system. Fleischer counters that according to his determination (based on the shifting of the *seder* start points), that the list of 167 *s'darim* must be a very early list as shifts which he considers to be instigated by the *baraita* had not yet occurred. Thus, he argues, the double reading on Shabbat Rosh Hodesh was just as early as that list of *s'darim*, and earlier than the others where the shifts have occurred. If so, then the number of *s'darim* should

---

<sup>182</sup> Fleischer, 111-114.

have been built around a system that did not interrupt the cycle on Rosh Hodesh and therefore needed more *s'darim* for a fixed cycle.<sup>183</sup>

With regard to the problematic *baraita* on the timing of the reading of two sections of curses during the year, Fleischer notes that this very problem came up in Old Cairo during the controversy over the Sequential Triennial Cycle that occurred during Maimonides' time. Those who wanted to end the practice saw it as contradicting the *baraita*. This suggests that, at least in that time and place, the Sequential Triennial Cycle was not tied to the calendar as Naeh suggests such that the curses fall before Shavuot of the sixth year and Rosh Hashanah at the end of the seventh.<sup>184</sup>

He then addresses the theory that the Shabbat before these two holidays was a special Shabbat like those in Adar, and the cycle was interrupted for a special reading of the curses. He points out that in all the lists and discussions of special Shabbatot in the Tannaitic and Amoraic texts, these are not listed among them, despite the fact that the curses are mentioned as a reading for fast days and there is discussion on how they may be divided. He furthermore points out that if *only* the curses were to be read on such a theoretical Shabbat morning and (as the Mishnah teaches) the reader cannot break in the middle of the curses, the curses would have to be read seven times on that day!<sup>185</sup> Additionally we have lists of the readings for special Shabbatot for the Sequential Triennial Cycle among the *g'nizah* documents and there is no indication of such a practice.

He also rejects Naeh's theory on the grounds that the author of the *baraita* in question surely would have mentioned that the readings of the curses were not every year, and there would have been no need to mention the curses in Deuteronomy at all, as with a fixed end around Sukkot, they would always fall before Rosh Hashanah at the end of the seventh year. Fur-

---

<sup>183</sup> Fleischer, 115.

<sup>184</sup> Fleischer, 116.

<sup>185</sup> Fleischer, 116-117.

thermore, he asks why out of all the *s'darim* to choose to fix the cycle to the calendar, would the creators of this system have chosen the curses in particular?<sup>186</sup> It should be pointed out that Fleischer's own understanding of the *baraita*, that it applied exclusively to the Annual Cycle, also does not address the question of why in particular the curses would be mentioned for fixing the cycle to the calendar.

Moving beyond his criticism of Naeh's theory, Fleischer also includes his own theory regarding the relationship between the Annual Cycle and the Sequential Triennial Cycle. He points to the fact that a high percentage of the *parashah* breaks in the Annual Cycle coincide with *seder* breaks in the Sequential Triennial Cycle as evidence that they must have developed in the same time and place (a conclusion which does not necessarily follow). He theorizes that both developed in Eretz Yisrael originally, with the Annual Cycle coming first.<sup>187</sup>

According to him, the beginning points of the Annual Cycle *parashiyyot* were preserved in the Sequential Triennial Cycle, except where they coincided with the beginning of readings for special occasions, in which case the starting points were moved (accounting for four of the places the cycles have divisions that do not coincide). To account for the remaining divisions that do not coincide, Fleischer suggests that originally the Annual Cycle had less *parashiyyot* due to the cycle being interrupted for the special Shabbatot in Adar (and possibly in Nissan) and Shabbat Hanukkah (either once or twice, depending on the year). When these occasions no longer interrupted the cycle, *parashiyyot* were further divided, creating the divisions which are not found in the Sequential Triennial Cycle.<sup>188</sup>

He adds that the Annual Cycle may reflect the focus of the early synagogue on study, and as that shifted to more of a focus on prayer, the Sequential Triennial Cycle was created to allow more time for additional liturgy. This lasted until it was no longer common for there to be a

---

<sup>186</sup> Fleischer, 117-118.

<sup>187</sup> Fleischer, 119.

<sup>188</sup> Fleischer, 119, 122.

*d'rash* and/or *piyyutim* incorporated into the service; after that, according to Fleischer, the synagogues of Eretz Yisrael, for the most part, reverted to the Annual Cycle. This explains how (also according to Fleischer) the *piyyutim* of Eliezer ben Kalir, who lived in Eretz Yisrael could reflect the Annual Cycle. Additionally, he understands the *baraita* of the curses as an assertion in defense of the original Annual Cycle.<sup>189</sup>

The following year, Naeh responded to Fleischer's article, reaffirming his theory of a Septennial Cycle. He dismisses Fleischer's criticism that the calculations involved in combining *s'darim* in order to get to the curses and end of the Torah at the right times are complicated by pointing out that in fact, having only these two fixed points, makes the system simpler than the Annual Cycle, which has a series of rules involved in determining which portions need to be combined in any given year.<sup>190</sup>

Naeh also addresses variant numbers of *s'darim* that do not fit his range of 141 to 167. With regard to the Y'rushalmi and Massekhet Sof'rim apparently referring to 175 *s'darim*, he says that the former is actually referring to the number of paragraphs in which commandments are given to Moses, and the latter is referring to 167 *s'darim* for regular Shabbatot plus eight readings for special occasions that interrupt the cycle, but are still read on Shabbat.<sup>191</sup> A *midrash* from the Tanḥuma mentions 275 *parashiyyot* in the Torah, but Naeh notes that in context this must refer to paragraphs and not reading divisions, even though as he points out, this is significantly less than the 670 paragraphs in the Masoretic text. He discusses another *midrash*, this time from Esther Rabbah, that seems to imply 155 *s'darim* corresponding to the word קנה by show-

---

<sup>189</sup> Fleischer, 120-121.

<sup>190</sup> Shlomo Naeh, "On the Septennial Cycle of the Torah Reading in Early Palestine," *Tarbiz*, Oct. 2004: 50.

<sup>191</sup> Naeh calculated in his previous article that there are a minimum of eight interruptions to the cycle each year: four special Shabbatot in Adar, one on each of Sukkot, Ḥanukkah, and Pesah, and at least one Rosh Ḥodesh that does not fall on one of the special Shabbatot. While this may be so, there would certainly be far more than eight different sections of the Torah assigned to special occasions that *could* fall on Shabbat since various days of Yom Tov, Ḥol Ha-moed, etc., each with different readings could fall on Shabbat.

ing that there is an alternative text found in manuscripts that stresses the 'ה in קנה as meaning five, and so the *midrash* is not about the number of *s'darim* at all. Finally, he addresses the number 137 from Fleischer's two *piyyutim* by noting that the *paiyy'tan's* other *piyyutim* reflect the Annual Cycle. The closest that his surviving work gets is two *piyyutim* for special Shabbatot that reflect the practice of Eretz Yisrael (which only establish that the Annual Cycle was in use in conjunction with the readings for special Shabbatot that originated in Eretz Yisrael). He suggests that perhaps 137 refers to the number of paragraphs containing commandments, but does not provide a great deal of support for this.<sup>192</sup>

Naeh also discusses at length the issue of interrupting the cycle on Rosh Ḥodesh. He brings evidence in Y'rushalmi that at least some localities in Amoraic period followed the ruling of Mishnah that Rosh Ḥodesh interrupts the cycle, but agrees that the sources also indicate the practice of continuing the cycle and adding on the special reading for that day. He also notes that the Y'rushalmi indicates that on Rosh Ḥodesh Tevet (i.e. Ḥanukkah), two different portions were read as further evidence that reading two different sections on one day was in practice. He agrees, in general, with Fleischer that over time practice changed to reading the Rosh Ḥodesh section in addition to the normal reading.<sup>193</sup>

He reaffirms his theory that the lists of *s'darim* developed during a very early period conforming to the practice in the Mishnah of interrupting the cycle on Rosh Ḥodesh, and that the tradition of these lists was maintained despite any changes that were introduced into the system later. He analyzes what would have been required to adapt the system to the development of not interrupting the cycle on Rosh Ḥodesh and determines that in a year where the calendar falls such that there are minimal cycle interruptions, a difference of only one additional *seder* would have been necessary. In years where the number interruptions was more than the minimum, there would have been enough *s'darim* left over from the extra interruptions to cover the extra Rosh

---

<sup>192</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 50-58.

<sup>193</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 59-61.

Ḥodesh or two where an additional *seder* would have been necessary. This means that in a seven year cycle, the worst-case scenario would have been that seven extra *s'darim* would have been necessary. He notes that even this scenario is not realistic as the number of interruptions would vary from year to year of the cycle and would not be the minimum for seven straight years. Thus, it would be rare that more *s'darim* than the 167 in the longest list would have been needed. Furthermore, the introduction of the practice that Fleischer reports of having additional special Shabbatot in Nissan, would have effectively balanced out the additional *s'darim* needed on Rosh Ḥodesh, and possibly even required *more* combination of *s'darim* during the course of the cycle.<sup>194</sup>

Regarding Fleischer's criticism of his interpretation of the *baraita* of the curses, Naeh responds to two of his points. He explains that the *baraita* is not more explicit about the curses being a fixed point in the cycle because its author was not trying to explain the workings of the cycle, but rather was simply observing the particularly unique situation that the curses always fell before Shavuot.<sup>195</sup> This is a bizarre interpretation, as clearly the attribution to Ezra make the *baraita* a statement of some significance and not a mere observation. What is more, Naeh's whole premise of the cycle being tied to the calendar at this point with the number of remaining *s'darim* fitting the weeks remaining in the cycle is based upon the understanding that the curses before Shavuot are a significant waypoint. If we accept Naeh's response here, then his claim is that there is actually *no* reference whatsoever to it being a waypoint in any text, as opposed to the one reference we would have from the *baraita*.

Responding to the matter of why the curses would be picked in particular, Naeh notes that there are a handful of "prominent" sections mentioned in the Y'rushalmi: the Song at the Sea, the Ten Commandments, and the curses. He explains that it makes sense to use a "prominent" section read around a "prominent" time to fix a point on the cycle to a point on the calen-

---

<sup>194</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 61-63.

<sup>195</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 65-66.

dar and this is what fit that requirement. Additionally, he notes that it has the benefit of turning something negative into something of useful value. He adds that his interpretation of the *baraita* is not essential to his theory of a Septennial Cycle, and thus if one wants to understand the *baraita* differently, it does not affect his general theory. He does not address the matter of the evidence from Old Cairo that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was attacked on the basis of not meeting the requirements of this *baraita*.<sup>196</sup>

Naeh also takes Fleischer's theory of an early Annual Cycle from which the Sequential Triennial Cycle originated and adapts it to his Septennial Cycle theory. If the Sequential Triennial Cycle was created simply out of a need for shorter weekly readings as Fleischer suggests, then the logical thing for its creators to do would be to simply split the existing weekly readings into smaller ones while keeping it fixed to the calendar over a longer number of years (keeping it fixed to start and end at Sukkot). He argues that the halakhic process generally moved towards establishing practices and not changing them once established, and so it is unlikely they would change this aspect of the reading system without any reason to do so. Continuing this line of thinking, Naeh asks why they would have established a cycle with a number of *s'darim* which does not fit (based on Naeh's calculations and assumptions) any round number of years. The combination of a count of *s'darim* which could fit three and a half years and the logical need to maintain a system fixed to the calendar at Sukkot leads to the conclusion that the system was designed to last seven years containing two cycles. He adds that with the Annual Cycle already restarting after Sukkot and evoking the practice of *hakhel*, it would seem reasonable that the seven year cycle would also have been chosen with that in mind. Naeh concludes this discussion by pointing out that there are logical arguments for either cycle being the first one, but both lead him to the logical conclusion that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was implemented as looping two times through the Torah in exactly seven years.<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 66.

<sup>197</sup> "Septennial Cycle", 67-69.

Naeh also responds to the criticism that there is no mention of *hakhel* in connection with the Sequential Triennial Cycle, either explicit or implicit, in any of the sources. He suggests that the association between the cycle and *hakhel* need only have existed when the system was created, and was unknown thereafter. Thus, while the system remained intact and still reflected *hakhel*, there was no mention of it in the sources.<sup>198</sup>

The major differences between the two theories are summed up in the following table:

**Table 7: A Comparison of the Theories of Naeh and Fleischer**

Naeh	Fleischer
Fixed to calendar at seven years/around Sukkot	Not fixed to calendar
154 <i>s'darim</i> OR: 141 1 <sup>st</sup> cycle; between 154-167 2 <sup>nd</sup>	Varying traditions for # of <i>s'darim</i> originating from 167
Portions combined (possibly in 2 <sup>nd</sup> cycle only)	No combination of portions
Interrupted cycle on Rosh Hodesh (at least originally)	Not interrupted on Rosh Hodesh
“curses” <i>baraita</i> applies to both cycles	“curses” <i>baraita</i> applies to Annual Cycle only
Either cycle could have come first	Annual Cycle came first

Both researchers’ arguments are based on reasoned hypotheses that the list(s) of *s'darim* that have come down to us are very early in origin, dating at least to the Tannaitic period, and have changed little (at least in number of *s'darim*) from that time. It is not clear that, in fact, this was the case. While some of Mann’s work in trying to detect early *s'darim* in the midrashic texts is questionable, it seems likely that at least some of this work indicates variant practices for where *s'darim* began. It is certainly conceivable that not only did the locations for breaks vary between times and locations, but so also did the number of *s'darim* in the list, and/or that the lists that we have today (and the number of entries therein) were of relatively late origin, after common practices had developed and spread (perhaps through the use of *piyyutim* and/or *midrashim*)

Additionally, both seem to be in agreement that it is impossible for any of the counts of *s'darim* from the full lists to be fit into a cycle of exactly three years. This rests on the assumption that the cycle was always practiced following the set of rules for interrupting the reading cycle laid down in either the Mishnah (including Rosh Hodesh) or a similar set that excludes Rosh Hodesh as an interruption. If, however, one were to calculate based on a set of interruption rules

---

<sup>198</sup> “Septennial Cycle”, 71.



that match the practice of the Annual Cycle (at least as it is known to us), that is, interrupting on Yom Tov and Ḥol Ha-moed only, then the maximum number of *s'darim* needed for a locality that does not observe Yom Tov Sheini is *exactly* 154<sup>199</sup> – the number of *s'darim* that occurs in the most sources! This could certainly be a coincidence, but it certainly seems that it bears consideration.

### *What Remains Unknown*

Despite all that we have learned about the Sequential Triennial Cycle, there are still many open questions:

- What did the Sequential Triennial Cycle first come into use?
- Was it fixed to the calendar in any way or was it read continuously (or perhaps both in different places and times)?
- If it was fixed to the calendar, how long did the cycle take to complete and at what point(s) in the year did it begin/end?
- How did the *seder* divisions become standardized (or at least semi-standardized)?
- Why are there differences in the number of *s'darim* between different sources?
- What were the various *haftarot* in regular use with the *s'darim* in different times/places? (We have much data on late period *haftarot* that ended up in Old Cairo, but some *haftarot* have few sources and/or we lack information on where they ended and/or skipped)
- Did the *baraita* regarding the reading of the curses apply to the Sequentially Triennial Cycle, and if so, how did it fit?
- On which special occasions was the Sequential Triennial Cycle interrupted?

---

<sup>199</sup> This number does derive from the use of the fixed calendar. Prior to the fixed calendar during the 4<sup>th</sup> century, more permutations were possible. It seems possible that the 154 *seder* system could have developed in a place and time in which the fixed calendar and the “modern” set of interruptions were in use.

- Were there standard divisions for the *aliyot*, and if so, what were they? If not, what rules for dividing readings were followed (i.e. starting/ending on a positive note, etc.)
- How were the short *s'darim* implemented, and did the *s'darim* sometimes or always overrun into the next week's *seder*?
- Besides Eretz Yisrael in the Amoraic and Gaonic periods and Old Cairo in the late Middle Ages, where and when else was the Sequential Triennial Cycle in use?
- When did the Sequential Triennial Cycle cease to be used, and why?

With luck, further discoveries and/or analysis will lead us to more answers to these questions and our knowledge of the historical Sequential Triennial Cycle will become more complete over time.

## Reviving the Sequential Triennial Cycle for Modern Synagogue Use

---

### *Introduction*

It is our goal to present a system for implementing the Sequential Triennial Cycle for use in the modern synagogue as an alternative to the Annual Cycle and to the halakhically problematic Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle which has been adopted by an increasing number of liberal congregations since its formal creation in the late 1980's. Such a system should ideally be halakhic, practical, aesthetic, and as historically accurate as the other limitations and our knowledge allow, with the priorities in roughly the order presented. In connection with the halakhic requirements, practicality and/or the aesthetics of the system, some historicity will need to be sacrificed. Those concessions will be:

- **The cycle will be fixed to three years exactly.** While it is possible that a cycle of precisely three years existed in some place and time (a possibility certainly suggested by the many records of the count of *s'darim* being 154), both of the prominent modern scholars who have studied the cycle believe that it lasted longer than three years. While a cycle that is not fixed to the calendar would be more historically accurate (at least following the more accepted theory of Fleischer), it would be difficult to organize and manage such a cycle, and potentially more chaotic if different congregations were to adopt variant practices. Modern Jews are used to a fixed cycle, and there does not appear to be any *halakhic* problem with a three year fixed cycle (indeed, for a long period of time the mainstream thought was that the Sequential Triennial Cycle lasted exactly this long).
- **The cycle will begin and end every three years on the last day of Sh'mini Atzeret<sup>200</sup>** (celebrated as Simḥat Torah in the Annual Cycle as well). This is not a practice original to the Sequential Triennial Cycle; however, neither is it a practice original to the Annual Cycle, but rather a later development. It has become a univer-

---

<sup>200</sup> i.e. the *only* day of Sh'mini Atzeret where Yom Tov Sheni is not practiced.

sal practice, is certainly halakhically acceptable, and there is little reason not to include this in the cycle.

- **The cycle will be interrupted *only* by Yom Tov and Ḥol Ha-moed, as is the practice in the modern Annual Cycle.** Little direct information is available as to on which occasions the cycle was interrupted historically in various places and times, but seeing as how this system for interrupting is practiced in the Annual Cycle, there can be no *halakhic* objection, and it seems practical and aesthetic to follow what has become the universal practice.
- **The cycle will contain 155 *s'darim*.** As we have seen, there are a maximum of 154 weeks in a three year cycle using the interruptions indicated above. One additional *seder* is necessary to accommodate Simḥat Torah. While 155 *s'darim* does not conform to the primary historical sources, we have seen that there *is* one historical reference to 155 *s'darim*, and our adaptation from 154 to 155 is in keeping with the shift of the final *seder* from Shabbat to Simḥat Torah.
- **In order to fit the fixed calendar, in most years, some *s'darim* will need to be combined (in a similar manner to the Annual Cycle).** Since the *haftarah* is linked directly to the first verse of the *seder*, it follows that when two *s'darim* are combined, the *haftarah* for the first of the two must be read. This differs from the Annual Cycle practice. There is no historical evidence as to the whether or not *s'darim* were combined, though it would likely not have been practiced if the cycle was not fixed to the calendar in any way.

**In all other regards, we shall strive to keep the system as historical as possible.** When we have conflicting information from different time periods, the data which most likely pertains to the practice of the Sequential Triennial Cycle in Old Cairo will be used. This is because it is the fullest set of data, and also the last known location where the historical cycle was still in practice. It makes sense to make our modern practice a continuation of the cycle as it was last known rather than reverting to earlier practices.

### *Previous Efforts to Create a Modern Sequential Triennial Cycle*

As we have seen, both Rabbi Lionel Moses and Rabbi Simchah Roth made efforts during the 20<sup>th</sup> century to reintroduce the Sequential Triennial Cycle in such a way that it would be practically usable in modern synagogues, halakhically valid, and based upon the historical Sequential Triennial Cycle. While Moses collected a great deal of important preliminary information for creating such a system, his system never actually came to light, apparently in part because the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards of the Conservative Movement in America created and approved a full system of reading for a different, non-sequential cycle. Roth, on the other hand, created a complete, usable system, and it is upon that system that the system presented here will be based.

Roth's system, however, was designed purely for use in Eretz Yisrael, where Yom Tov Sheini is not generally practiced. Yom Tov Sheini for both Pesah and Shavuot can fall on Shabbat, which reduces the number of available Shabbatot in a three year cycle for the *s'darim* of the cycle. Thus, minor adjustments need to be made for these cases in order for the system to be used in congregations which observe Yom Tov Sheini.

Additionally, while Roth provides a full breakdown of readings for his system, the vast majority of the *haftarot* for that system cannot be found in a standard Annual Cycle *humash*. This means that any congregation that wishes to implement his system would either need to read the weekly *haftarah* without providing any written copy for the members of the congregation to follow, or distribute photocopies of the *haftarah* each week (a cumbersome process). In order for the system to be practical, there is a need to print a collection of the *haftarot* for the cycle for use in the synagogue. Such a collection would also be beneficial in making the Torah divisions and rationale for the system better known and understood to the layperson.

Roth's system also takes some liberties with the historical record, which the system here will attempt to rectify, while leaving the possibility of using the *haftarah* collection with Roth's system open as well. Roth uses a number of Mann's *seder* breaks that are not part of the histori-

cal record from the *g'nizah*, and in a number of cases are also not found in the complete lists of *s'darim* from Masoretic texts. These are mostly based on Mann's projections based on what he saw in *midrashim*. As we have seen, Mann's assumptions and speculations based the *midrashim* have been called into question by a number of scholars. In addition, even if these *seder* breaks existed in some place and time, using them is inconsistent with more generally using the late *se-der* breaks. Combined with our stated goal to use the later practice over the former, the system presented here will not use any *seder* break which is not part of the evidence that we have from the later period of the cycle's use. This also means that the handful of *seder* breaks that Roth himself invented in order to avoid short *s'darim* will not be used in this system.

Additionally, Roth took his *haftarot* directly from the work of Mann (at least, for the *s'darim* on which Mann wrote notes before his premature death). Mann had limited data available to him, and while his conclusions regarding the starting points of the *haftarot* are generally borne out by the evidence that was later found, his assumptions and guesses regarding the length of the *haftarot*, including where they skipped and ended, were in nearly all cases disproven by the evidence from the *g'nizah*. Additionally, Roth relied on Wacholder's list for the starting points of the *haftarot* for the remaining *s'darim* on which Mann did not complete his notes. A fair number of the *haftarot* on this list were also disproven by the *g'nizah* evidence that later came to light. Finally, since Roth created new *seder* divisions, he was also forced to invent new *haftarah* divisions. In all of these cases, we will base ourselves on the *g'nizah* evidence over Roth's compilation, but where there are multiple options or limited data and Roth's *haftarah* is feasible based on the evidence, we will prefer his selection over other possibilities. One hopes that Roth would not object to such changes, as he himself says of the *haftarot* in his table:

מכיוון שרבות מן ההפטרות הללו קשות להבנה לבני העידן שלנו, אני מציע  
לאמץ את לוח הזה רק באופן התחילתי. אין מניעה הלכתית שתמנע שהכנסת  
הרבנים בעתיד להציע הפטרות אחרות לסדרים כולם או מקצתם, הפטרות  
המתאימות יותר לבני הדור; ויפה תעשה עם תציע הצעות כאלה מדי פעם, לפי  
הכללים ששרטטתי לעיל.

Since the majority of these *haftarot* are difficult to understand for people of our era, I am proposing to adopt this table only as a starting method. There is no halakhic impediment that would prevent the Rabbinical Assembly from suggesting other *haftarot* for some or all of the *s'darim* in the future – *haftarot* that are more appropriate for the people of this generation. And it would be nice if you would offer such suggestions occasionally according to the rules I outlined above.<sup>201</sup>

Certainly Roth's intention here is to move further *away* from the historical *haftarot*, rather than towards them as we seek to do; however, it is clear that he sees no difficulty in making changes to the list of *haftarot*. With this in mind, our system will adjust the ending points and skipping in the *haftarot* as the historical evidence suggests without preserving the Mann/Wacholder/Roth speculations. Where the *haftarah* is completely different, but there is historic evidence for it, it will be preserved as an alternative *haftarah*.

### ***Halakhah***

Before looking at the details of the reading system, the halakhic parameters for a Torah reading system need to be defined. The most widely accepted halakhic text in our time is the Shulḥan Arukh, and so we will look at the relevant *halakhot* there. We will assume that any *halakhah* that is not clearly and directly tied to the Annual Cycle via its links to the calendar is operative in a modern Sequential Triennial Cycle, even if we have reason to believe that in the times and places that the Sequential Triennial Cycle was previous practiced, this may not have been the *halakhah* and/or actual practice.

First and foremost, the Shulḥan Arukh codifies the main operating principle for any Shabbat morning Torah reading cycle:

מקום שמפסיקין בשבת שמפסיקים בשבת בשחרית שם קורין במנחה ובשני  
ובחמישי ובשבת הבאה:

הגה: אם בטלו שבת אחת קריאת הפרשה בצבור לשבת הבאה קורין אותה  
פרשה עם פרשה השייכה לאותה שבת.

---

<sup>201</sup> Roth, 129.

The place where we stop on Shabbat - where we stop on Shabbat morning, we [start to] read [from] there at [Shabbat] Minhah, on Monday, on Thursday, and on the following Shabbat [morning].

**Gloss:** If they neglected to hold] the public reading of the *parashah* on a Shabbat, then for the following Shabbat they read that *parashah* (i.e. the missed one) along with the *parashah* belonging to that (i.e. the following) Shabbat.<sup>202</sup>

This reaffirms the halakhic requirement of a sequential system. There is not even a mention of the alternative practice from the Tosefta of reading the week's Torah portion over the course of the week's Torah readings. We will also need to keep this principle in mind when deciding how to resolve the problem of short *s'darim*.

The requirement for the number of readers on Shabbat is established: "מוציאין ספר תורה" "וקורין בו שבעה ואם רצה להוסיף מוסיף." "We bring out a Torah scroll and seven read from it. And if one wants to add [to the number of readings], one adds."<sup>203</sup> The minimum number of verses is set as well: "אין קורין עם כל אחד פחות מג' פסוקים" "Each one does not read any less than 3 verses."<sup>204</sup>

The Shulhan Arukh also codifies the *halakhah* for where an *aliyah* (or *seder*) may begin and end:

הקורא בתורה לא ישייר בפרשה פחות מג' פסוקים מפני היוצאים אז מבית הכנסת שיאמרו העולה אחריו לא יקרא אלא שני פסוקים הנשארים וכן לא יתחיל בה פחות מג' פסוקים מפני הנכנסים אז בבית הכנסת שיאמרו שלא קרא הראשון אלא ב' פסוקים.

הגה: ואין חילוק בין פרשה פתוחה לסתומה ופרשה שאינה רק ב' פסוקים מותר לשייר בתחלה ולהפסיק שם ויכוין שיתחיל תמיד לקרא בדבר טוב ויסיים בדבר טוב:

The one who reads the Torah may not leave over less than three verses in a paragraph because of those who leave the synagogue then and will say that the *oleh* (i.e. reader) after him will read nothing but the two remaining verses [of the para-

---

<sup>202</sup> Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 135:2.

<sup>203</sup> Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 282:1.

<sup>204</sup> Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 137:2. The immediate context is weekdays, but it is clear from the implications in the following passages that it applies on Shabbat as well.



graph]. And similarly, one may not begin less than three verses into it (i.e. a paragraph) because of those who enter the synagogue then and will say that the first [reader] did not read anything but two verses.

**Gloss:** And there is no difference between an open paragraph and a closed paragraph. And a paragraph that does not have [more than] just two verses: it is permitted to leave over [these two verses] at the beginning [of a paragraph] and to stop there. And one should aim to always begin to read on a good matter and to end on a good matter.<sup>205</sup>

This *halakhah* codifies the practice we saw in both Talmuds of not stopping or starting an *aliyah* within less than three verses from a paragraph break unless the paragraph in its entirety is less than three verses. This rule will be critical in dividing the *aliyot* for the cycle. This gloss provides an additional consideration for this process: beginning and ending on a positive note. Despite the fact that the earliest known source for doing such seems to have been specifically with regard to reading the curses, here the practice is codified as a general rule. The reason for this may lie in the fact that the Y'rushalmi tells us that *b'rakhot* were recited before and after the reading of the section of the curses, which was unusual for that time period. The desire in that case, therefore, would have been to link each of those *b'rakhot* to a positive statement. Since in later times it became the practice for *b'rakhot* to be recited in each and every one of the day's readings, this generalization makes sense. On the other hand, the practical evidence from both the Annual Cycle *parashah* and *aliyah* divisions and the Sequential Triennial Cycle *seder* divisions seems to indicate that this practice was a preference, but was not adhered to strictly. This may be reflected in the language of the Shulḥan Arukh, which could have just said "one shall begin to read on a good matter."

With regard to a reader repeating verses previously read (as part of the statutory *aliyot* and excluding any repetition by the Maftir), the Shulḥan Arukh rules:

הקורא בתורה ראשון וקרא השני מה שקרא הראשון אם הוסיף על מה שקרא  
הראשון ג' פסוקים או אפילו שנים במקום דלא אפשר אותו שני עולה מן המנין  
ואם לאו אינו עולה מן המנין חוץ מפרי החג משום דלא אפשר:

---

<sup>205</sup> Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 138:1.

[There was] a first Torah reader, and the second [reader] read what the first had [already] read: if he added three verses to what was already read by the first or even two in a place where there was no possibility for it (i.e. adding three), the second is included in the count [of valid *aliyot*], but if not, he is not included in the count. [This] excludes [the portion of] the bulls of [Ḥol Ha-moed] Ḥag (i.e. Sukkot) because there is no possibility [of adding additional verses].<sup>206</sup>

This will come into play in cases of short *s'darim* that cannot be divided without repetition. There is a clear hierarchy here: repetition is to be avoided if possible; if not possible, each reader must add two new verses. If there are not enough verses in the whole *seder* for even this, then and only then may whole *aliyot* be repeated, as there is no alternative. This last case is what is being referenced as “the bulls of Ḥag.” As Elbogen describes the current practice, “each day the sacrifices of three days are read... and afterwards the first two are repeated... [In Palestine each day’s passage is read four times, one after the other].”<sup>207</sup> This is the case of having no alternative, and we see that in Eretz Yisrael, the same three verses are repeated *four* times – certainly a precedent for repeating as many times as necessary when there is no other option.

There are some additional *halakhot* of note in Oraḥ Ḥayyim, Chapter 428. Section 4 details the way that the *parashiyyot* of the Annual Cycle are fixed to the calendar. Needless to say, this *halakhah* does not and cannot apply to the Sequential Triennial Cycle. Section 5 fixes the *aliyah* divisions for the poem of “*ha-azinu*” in Deuteronomy 32, which applies as much to the Sequential Triennial Cycle as to the Annual Cycle. Section 6 establishes that the neither of the sections of the curses may be divided in practice, and the *aliyah* containing them must include additional verses before and after the curses. Finally, Section 7 establishes that the last eight verses of the Torah may not be subdivided. These last three sections will be relevant to our division of the *aliyot* in the four *s'darim* containing the referenced sections.

With regard to the required length of the *haftarah*, the Shulḥan Arukh rules:

מפטירין בנביא מענינה של פרשה ואין פוחתין מכ"א פסוקים אלא אם כן  
 סליק ענינא בבציר מהכי כגון עולותיכם ספו על זבחיכם.

---

<sup>206</sup> Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 137:6.

<sup>207</sup> Elbogen, 137.

We conclude in the Prophets based upon the subject of the *parashah*, and we do not decrease [the length of the *haftarah*] from 21 verses other than if the matter is settled in less than that, for example, “add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices” [in Jeremiah 7:21].<sup>208</sup>

This reaffirms the “standard” length of the *haftarah* at 21 verses, and allows for less if the subject of the *haftarah* is concluded in less, but it makes no mention of shortening the *haftarah* in a place where a translator is used or a *d’rash* is given, as mentioned in previous sources. This may well be because these were no longer in practice by this point in time,<sup>209</sup> and so there was no practical value to codifying the shortening. Certainly, it is clear from the earlier *halakhic* sources that it was an acceptable practice in those times. Nevertheless, we need to be aware that the *haftarot* on record for the Sequential Triennial Cycle are almost always shorter than 21 verses, which could be understood to be in conflict with the Shulḥan Arukh as written. Even assuming that there is a conflict (which is certainly not clear), one can, perhaps, justify the shorter *haftarot* by saying that they are an inherent part of the Sequential Triennial Cycle just as the *halakhot* that pertain to how the Torah readings fit the calendar are inoperative on it, so this *halakhah* is inoperative. We will need to consider both sides of this matter in our *haftarah* selection.

The above *halakhah* also notes that the connection between the Torah reading and *haftarah* is the subject matter. This is certainly true in the Annual Cycle *haftarot*, but is not exactly the basis of the selection for the Sequential Triennial Cycle *haftarot*, which, as we have seen, are primarily based on a common word in the opening verses of the two readings. This is not to say that the *haftarot* do not also often have thematic linking points to their *s’darim*, but it does not seem to have been the *basis* of selection. There is enough ambiguity in “the subject of the *parashah*”; however, that linking based on a common word could fit that description, and there is certainly strong historical precedent for using this system of selection.

The Shulḥan Arukh also codifies the rules for skipping within a Torah reading or *haftarah*:

---

<sup>208</sup> Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 284:1.

<sup>209</sup> As indicated by Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 145:3.

מדלגין בנביא ואין מדלגין בתורה מפרשה זו לפרשה אחרת והני מילי בשני ענינים דחיישינן שמא תתבלבל דעת השומעים אבל בחד ענינא כגון אחרי מות ואך בעשור שכהן גדול קורא ביום הכפורים מדלגין והוא שלא יקרא על פה שאסור לקרות שלא מן הכתב אפילו תיבה אחת ובנביא מדלגין אפילו בשני ענינים והוא שלא ישהה בדילוג בענין שיעמדו הצבור בשתיקה והני מילי בנביא אחד אבל מנביא לנביא אין מדלגין ובתרי עשר מדלגין מנביא לנביא ובלבד שלא ידלג מסוף הספר לתחלתו

We skip in the Prophets, but we do not skip in the Torah from one section to another section. And these words are regarding two subjects where we are worried that perhaps the mind of the listeners will be confused, but with one subject, for example “Aḥarei Mot” [Lev. 16:1] and “Akh Be-asor” [Lev. 23:27] that the High Priest reads on Yom Kippur, we skip. And it is so he will not recite [the portion] by heart, as it is forbidden to recite even one word that is not from writing. And in the Prophets, we skip even between two subjects. And this is if one does not delay when skipping into [another] matter so that the congregation stands in silence [waiting]. And these words are regarding within one [book of the Prophets], but from one [book of the Prophets] to another [book of the Prophets], we do not skip. And within the Trei Asar (i.e. Twelve Minor Prophets), we skip from prophet to prophet. And this is only so long as one does not skip from the end of the book to its beginning.<sup>210</sup>

This *halakhah* is very much in keeping with the earlier sources we have seen. The skipping in the Sequential Triennial Cycle *haftarot* conforms to this scheme. Since we lack information on the extent and skipping in some of these *haftarot* we will need to take these rules into account if we are to perform any skipping in those *haftarot*.

The *halakhot* that we have looked at establish the parameters within which we need to work to create a halakhic reading system. It is worth noting that based on the sources that a system which involves skipping in the Torah from one week to the next such as the modern Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle does not seem to have any halakhic support. Similarly, the modern Torah reading practice of reading the beginning of each *parashah* and then skipping to different *aliyot* of the *parashah* in different years is problematic. The *halakhah*, as it developed, also does

---

<sup>210</sup> Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 144:1.

not permit another modern system, the reading of the weekly portion split over the four weekly readings; however, as we have seen there was at least some history for that practice in the Tanna-itic period. The halakhic problems with these three systems point to the importance of developing a usable Sequential Triennial Cycle system that can meet halakhic requirements and enable congregations to have a shorter weekly reading than the Annual Cycle allows.

### ***Reconstructing Late Historical Practice***

Since it is our stated goal to build our system off of the Sequential Triennial Cycle as practiced in its late historical period, we must understand what that practice was. The historical information we have collected in the first part of this work provides the basis for this, but there are gaps in the historical record and conflicts. Decisions need to be made as to how to best handle these while preserving the historical basis of the system and operating within the constraints of our system which we have previously established.

The first step in implementing a reading system is determining where each of the 155 *s'darim* will begin. Our stated intent is to use only *s'darim* that are based on the late practice, which will rule out anything based purely on *midrashim* or early *piyyutim*. Our *g'nizah* evidence has provided us with 158 different *s'darim* from a wide variety of sources. Few of these sources indicate more than a handful of *s'darim* on their own, with the largest of them indicating roughly half of the *s'darim*. Based on this information, we cannot with any certainty create an internally consistent system that follows the practice of any one place and time.

On the other hand, we do have two complete lists of 154 *s'darim* from our Masoretic sources: the Bomberg Bible and the end notes from the "Damascus Keter". The simplest solution to using a late-period, internally consistent list would be to use one of these, splitting one *seder* at a break known from other sources to reach 155. The difficulty with this is that the only source of *haftarah* data we have is the *g'nizah* documents. Each of these lists can only be used in conjunction with the *haftarah* data if all 154 *s'darim* on the list are represented in that data.

There is a *seder* at Leviticus 23:15 in both full lists that is not found in the *g'nizah* documents. Instead they have a *seder* at 23:9, and so the problem could easily be remedied by shifting that one *seder* to 23:15 so it matches the practice represented by the *g'nizah* documents. Both lists, however, have a *seder* at Genesis 12:10 which is not found in the *g'nizah* texts. A remedy for this is somewhat more complicated: the Damascus Keter has a *seder* at Genesis 8:1, but none at Genesis 8:15, while the opposite is true in the Bomberg Bible. We have *g'nizah* data for both of these *s'darim* (and all evidence shows that in that tradition both of these were used as *s'darim*), and so by using both, we can balance out the absent *seder* at Genesis 12:10. Although no longer completely internally consistent, this method allows us our choice of either of the two complete lists, with only two modifications based on the *g'nizah* documents.

Another method to determine the *s'darim* would be to take the list of 158 *s'darim* from the *g'nizah* data and remove three *s'darim* that are not represented in *all* the *g'nizah* data. There are four such *s'darim*: Genesis 49:27, Exodus 7:8, Exodus 16:4, and Numbers 31:25. Since the data comes from different documents, it is unlikely that removing three of these would represent any single custom that was once in existence, but it is at least *possible* that it would. Exodus 16:4 is a prime candidate for removal, as three out of five sources testify against it and removing it resolves a short *seder* problem. Genesis 49:27 is also absent from the Bomberg Bible list, perhaps giving it an edge over the remaining two for removal. Exodus 7:8 has six sources testifying to its practice and one against while Numbers 31:25 has two for and one against, so perhaps Exodus 7:8 has an edge as the one out of the four to keep.

A third method would be to start with the *g'nizah* data and eliminate one the endpoints of each of the three *s'darim* that are the shortest and will thus result in the most repetition in those weeks' readings. These would be Genesis 8:1/8:15 at fourteen verses (as noted above, both of these endpoints have precedents for their absence in the Masoretic documents), Numbers 11:16/11:23 at seven verses and Numbers 25:1/25:10 at nine verses. This solution also has the advantage that Roth too eliminates one *seder* from each pair, and thus the system would be more

similar to his. While this would be the most aesthetic solution from a practical reading standpoint, it would also be the least historically based.

All three of these options have merit, but since we have asserted that historicity is a major goal in this project, we will choose the second of these, as it is the most internally consistent to historical sources. A table of our *s'darim* and Roth's can be found at the end of this section. We have bolded the places where the two systems differ for comparison. The three *s'darim* for which we have *g'nizah* information, but which we are eliminating to get our count to 155 are shown with a strikethrough and not included in the numbering.

It is also important to establish a system for referring to the different *s'darim*. Roth simply assigned each of his *s'darim* numbers, and we can do the same, though the numbering schemes will rarely match between Roth's system and our own. It is, however, more practical and aesthetic to name each *seder*. The Yannai *piyyutim* and *g'nizah haftarah* data generally identifies each *seder* with a title based on the first significant and distinct words of that *seder*. This is a similar convention to the Annual Cycle, although in that system, most *parashiyyot* are named by just one word, whereas the *s'darim* of the Sequential Triennial Cycle are usually identified with multiple words. It seems desirable, then, to restore the historical practice of using the first significant words as a title. There is considerable inconsistency in the titling from the historical sources, allowing us flexibility in choosing the words of our titles. Though the historical titles would sometimes include one of the divine names as part of the phrase used as the title, this is not desirable if the *seder* name are going to be used for common reference. Thus, the titles selected will all avoid using divine names as part of the title, even if the obvious title would be one that included a divine name.

The next (and more difficult) challenge in creating the system is choosing a *haftarah* for every *seder*. As discussed above, the *g'nizah* evidence was the basis for choosing the selections. Effort was made to make each *haftarah* fit exactly one of the historical sources for its *seder*, but it is not possible to use consistent source documents for all *s'darim*. There was thus little attempt made to use the same source document for each of the *haftarot* it provided. Where there was in-

sufficient data, guesses were made that followed the known patterns for historical *haftarot*. It is certainly possible that more historical data will come to light in the future, in which case it would be the intention to update the system to use the hard facts over speculation. In a few cases, the historical ending verse was questionable as to whether it would be looked at as positive to a modern reader. In those cases, an additional positive verse has been added in brackets as optional.

A problem with the historical *haftarot* in general is that most all of them are very short - in the vicinity of ten verses. As discussed above, this raises some mild halakhic questions for any selection where the subject is not completed by the end of the selection. The halakhic questions become much greater, however, if the system is being used in a congregation that does not have a sermon, *d'var Torah*, or running translation. Without one of these, there is no halakhic permission to have *haftarot* this short (again, unless they complete their subjects). For these reasons both a “short *haftarah*” based on the historical record and a “long *haftarah*” (starting and sometimes ending in the same place, but with more verses) are provided in the below table. When possible, the Romaniote and Karaite *haftarot* were used as reference for the long *haftarot* since we have seen they have clear ties to the Sequential Triennial Cycle. These generally seem to have been designed to extend the *haftarah* to exactly 21 verses, but occasionally do so by ending in a less-than-ideal place. In these cases, the *haftarah* has been extended to a better ending location, shortened to the end of a subject, or supplemented with a positive concluding verse. In some of these cases, the additional verse(s) have been listed in brackets as optional.

The “long *haftarot*” are, in general, otherwise not historical, but are extensions of the historical “short *haftarot*” so that they either complete a subject or reach at least 21 verses, while ending on a positive note. They are presented as an unquestionably halakhic (and not entirely historical) alternative.

There are a number of *haftarot* that will never be recited in this system. This is due to the fact that there are eleven consecutive weeks each year, starting towards the end of Tammuz in which the normal *haftarot* are replaced by special ones. Even accounting for the fact that in dif-



ferent sets of three years the calendar and the cycle will align differently, there will be some *haftarot* that are never used. This is an artifact of the fixing of the cycle to a three year calendar. These *haftarot* have been included in the below table for reference purposes, but italicized.

**Table 8: *S'darim* and *Haftarot* for a Modern Sequential Triennial Cycle Implementation**

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
בראשית ברא	1. Gen. 1:1	1. Gen. 1:1	Is. 65:17-25, 66:22	Is. 65:17-66:1	Is. 65:17-66:13
אלה תולדות השמים	2. Gen. 2:4	2. Gen. 2:4	Is. 51:6-16	Is. 51:6-16	Is. 51:6-52:6
הן האדם	3. Gen. 3:22	3. Gen. 3:22	Ez. 28:13-19, 24-26	Ez. 28:13-19, 25	Ez. 28:13-26
זה ספר תולדות	4. Gen. 5:1	4. Gen. 5:1	Is. 29:18-24, 30:15	Is. 29:18-24, 30:18	Is. 29:18-30:18
אלה תולדות נח	5. Gen. 6:9	5. Gen. 6:9	Is. 54:9-17, 55:5	Is. 54:9-55:5	Is. 54:9-55:12
ויזכור	6. Gen. 8:1	6. Gen. 8:1	Hab. 3:2-10, 19	Hab. 3:2-19	Hab. 3:2-19
צא מן התבה	7. Gen. 8:15			Is. 42:7-15, 42:21	Is. 42:7-43:8
ויהיו בני נח	8. Gen. 9:18	7. Gen. 9:18	Is. 49:9-17, 23	Is. 49:9-23	Is. 49:9-23
ויהי כל הארץ	9. Gen. 11:1	8. Gen. 11:1	Zeph. 3:9-17, 20	Zeph. 3:9-17, 20	Zeph. 3:9-20
לך לך מארצך	10. Gen. 12:1	9. Gen. 12:1	Josh. 24:3-10, 14	Josh. 24:3-10, 14	Josh. 24:3-23
ויהי בימי אמרפל	11. Gen. 14:1	10. Gen. 14:1	Is. 41:2-4, 8-13	Is. 41:2-13	Is. 41:2-41:16
במחזה	12. Gen. 15:1	11. Gen. 15:1	Is. 1:1-8, 2:2-3	Is. 1:1-8, 2:2-3	Is. 1:1-20, 2:2-3
ושרי אשת אברם	13. Gen. 16:1			Is. 54:1-10	Is. 54:1-10
ויהי אברם בן תשעים	14. Gen. 17:1	12. Gen. 17:1	Jer. 33:23-34:5, 12-13	Jer. 33:23-34:5	Jer. 33:23-34:7
וירא	15. Gen. 18:1	13. Gen. 18:1	Is. 33:17-24, 35:10 <sup>212</sup>	Is. 33:17-24, 35:10	Is. 33:17- 34:12, 35:10
ויבאו שני מלכים	16. Gen. 19:1	14. Gen. 19:1	Jud. 19:16-24, 20:27	Is. 17:14-18:7, 19:25	Is. 17:14-18:7, 19:25
ויסע משם אברהם	17. Gen. 20:1	15. Gen 19:24 <sup>213</sup>	Amos 4:7-5:4 <sup>214</sup>	Is. 61:9-62:5, 62:8-9	Is. 61:9-63:9
פקד את שרה	18. Gen. 21:1	16. Gen. 21:1	I Sam. 2:21-28, 3:19-20	I Sam. 2:21-28	I Sam. 2:21-36, 3:19-20

<sup>211</sup> 129-133.

<sup>212</sup> There is an error in Roth's list here where it reads 14-17 instead of 17-24. The latter is what he must have intended based on Mann and all the sources.

<sup>213</sup> This *seder* is not found in any *g'nizah* list, Yannai's *piyyutim*, or Masoretic text. The only evidence for it is a Y'lammeinu *midrash* in the Tanhuma (Buber)

16. Mann considers and then dismisses the possibility that this is actually a special reading for a fast day during a drought (I, 161).

<sup>214</sup> This *haftarah* is explicitly Roth's invention.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
נסה את אברהם	19. Gen. 22:1	17. Gen. 22:1	Is. 33:7-16, 22	Is. 33:7-16, 22	Is. 33:7-34:4, 35:10
ואברהם זקן	20. Gen. 24:1	18. Gen. 24:1	Is. 51:2-11	Is. 51:2-11	Is. 51:2-22
ואבא היום אל העין	21. Gen. 24:42	19. Gen. 24:42	Is. 12:3-13:4, 14:1-2	Is. 12:3-13:4, 14:32	Is. 12:3-13:16, 14:32
ויסף אברהם	<b>22. Gen. 25:1</b>			II Sam. 5:13-21, 6:1-2	II Sam. 5:13-6:8, 6:17
ואלה תולדת יצחק	23. Gen. 25:19	20. Gen. 25:19	Is. 65:23-66:8	Is. 65:23-66:8	Is. 65:23-66:18
ויזרע יצחק	24. Gen. 26:12	21. Gen. 26:12	Is. 62:8-63:4, 63:7	Is. 62:8-63:7	Is. 62:8-63:16
ויהי כי זקן יצחק	25. Gen. 27:1	22. Gen. 27:1	I Sam. 4:15-5:1, 6:14 <sup>215</sup>	Is. 46:3-10, 47:4	Is. 46:3-47:10, 48:12
מטל השמים	26. Gen. 27:28	23. Gen. 27:28	Hos. 14:6-10, Joel 1:1-3, 2:12-13 <sup>215</sup>	Mic. 5:6-6:2, 6:8	Mic. 5:6-6:8
ויצא יעקב מבאר שבע	27. Gen. 28:10	24. Gen. 28:10	Hos. 12:13-13:5, 14:9-10	Hos. 12:13-13:4, 14:10	Hos. 12:13-14:3
כי שנואה לאה	28. Gen. 29:31	25. Gen. 29:31	I Sam. 1:2-1:11, 2:28 <sup>215</sup>	Is. 60:15-20, 61:9	Is. 60:15-61:9
וישמע אליה	29. Gen. 30:22	26. Gen. 30:22	I Sam. 1:11-19, 22	I Sam. 1:11-22	I Sam. 1:11-2:3
שוב אל ארץ אבותיך	30. Gen. 31:3	27. Gen. 31:3	Jer. 30:10-18, 22	Jer. 30:10-18	Jer. 30:10-31:6
וישלח יעקב מלאכים	31. Gen. 32:4	28. Gen. 32:4	Ob. 1:1-9, 21	Ob. 1:1-11, 21	Ob. 1:1-21
ויבא יעקב שלם	32. Gen. 33:18	29. Gen. 33:18	Nah. 1:12-2:6, 14	Nah. 1:12-2:5; Hab. 2:3	Nah. 1:12-3:3, Hab. 2:3
בבאו מפדן ארם	33. Gen. 35:9	30. Gen. 35:9	Is. 43:1-7, 19-21	Is. 43:1-7, 21	Is. 43:1-21
וישב יעקב	34. Gen. 37:1	31. Gen. 37:1	Is. 32:18-33:6, 15	Is. 32:18-33:6, 22	Is. 32:18-33:22
וירד יהודה	35. Gen. 38:1	32. Gen. 38:1	Is. 37:31-35, 38:1-6	Is. 37:31-38:6	Is. 37:31-38:8
ויוסף הורד מצרימה	36. Gen. 39:1	33. Gen. 39:1	Is. 52:3-10, 53:4-5	Is. 52:3-10, 53:4-5	Is. 52:3-53:7, 54:8
		<b>34. Gen. 40:1<sup>216</sup></b>	Zeph. 1:17-2:5, 8-10 <sup>217</sup>		
מקץ שנתים ימים	37. Gen. 41:1	35. Gen. 41:1	Is. 29:8-14, 18-19	Is. 29:8-19	Is. 29:8-24

<sup>215</sup> This *haftarah* is not found on any of the *g'nizah* lists, but is based on a *k'rovah* of Shimon HaKohein ben Megas (see Mann I, 209, 216, 237, 380).

<sup>216</sup> This *seder* is not found in any *g'nizah* list, Yannai's *piyyutim* or Y'lamm'deinu *midrash*, but is found in the longer lists of *s'darim* in the Leningrad Codex.

Mann also mentions some references to it in some less prominent sources (I, 307, 537; II, 120).

<sup>217</sup> This *haftarah* is pure speculation on Mann's part.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
הנמצא כזה איש	38. Gen. 41:38	36. Gen. 41:38	Is. 11:2-10, 16	Is. 11:2-12, 16	Is. 11:2-12:6
זאת עשו וחי	39. Gen. 42:18	37. Gen. 42:18	Is. 50:10-51:7, 11	Is. 50:10-51:8	Is. 50:10-51:8
יתן לכם רחמים	40. Gen. 43:14	38. Gen. 43:14	Jer.42:12-20, 43:12	Jer.42:12-20, 43:12	Jer. 42:12-43:12
ויגש אליו יהודה	41. Gen. 44:18	39. Gen. 44:18	Josh. 14:6-15	Josh. 14:6-15	Josh. 14:6-15
		<b>40. Gen 45:19<sup>218</sup></b>	Amos 2:13, 3:1-8 <sup>214</sup>		
ואת יהודה שלח	42. Gen. 46:28	41. Gen. 46:28	Zech. 10:6-12, 11:4-11	Zech. 10:6-12	Zech. 10:6-12
הנה אביך חלה	<b>43. Gen. 48:1</b>	<b>42. Gen. 47:29<sup>219</sup></b>	I Kin. 2:1-10, 12	II Kin. 13:14-23	II Kin. 13:14-14:7, [14:17]
ויקרא יעקב אל בניו	44. Gen. 49:1	43. Gen. 49:1	Is. 43:22-44:2, 6	Is. 43:22-44:6	Is. 43:22-44:21
	<del>Gen. 49:27</del>			<del>Zech. 14:1-11</del>	
ואלה שמות בני ישראל	45. Ex. 1:1	44. Ex. 1:1	Is. 27:6-28:1, 5	Is. 27:6-13, 28:5	Is. 27:6-28:13, [29:22-23]
ומשה היה רעה	46. Ex. 3:1	45. Ex. 3:1	Is. 40:11-18, 21-22	Is. 40:11-22	Is. 40:11-31
וישב אל יתר	47. Ex. 4:18	46. Ex. 4:18	II Sam. 15:7-15, 37 <sup>220</sup>	Is. 55:12-56:8	Is. 55:12-56:8
וארא	48. Ex. 6:2	47. Ex. 6:2	Is. 52:6-13, 53:4-5 <sup>215</sup>	Is. 42:8-21	Is. 42:8-43:5
כי ידבר עלכם פרעה	49. Ex. 7:8	48. Ex. 7:8	Joel 3:3-4:6, 4:16	Joel 3:3-4:6, 4:16	Joel 3:3-4:18
הנה יוצא המימה	50. Ex. 8:16	49. Ex. 8:16	I Sam. 12:7-16 <sup>220</sup>	Is. 34:11-35:4	Is. 34:11-35:10
		<b>50. Ex. 9:13<sup>219</sup></b>	Is. 34:11-35:2, 10 <sup>221</sup>		

<sup>218</sup> The *seder* is explicitly Roth's invention.

<sup>219</sup> This *seder* is not found in any *g'nizah* list, Yannai's *piyyutim*, or Masoretic text. The only evidence for it is found in the *midrashim* (see Mann I, 341-345, 396-397, 407-410, 453-459, II 38-41, 198-201).

<sup>220</sup> This *haftarah* is not found in any *g'nizah* list, Yannai's *piyyutim*, or Masoretic text. The only evidence for it is found in *midrashim* (see Mann I, 370-373, 395-398, 479-480; II, 71-75, 178-185).

<sup>221</sup> Roth would appear to have taken the primary *haftarah* from the previous *seder* for which we have the most evidence and used it here for this questionable *se-der* for which there is no *haftarah* data. Unfortunately, there does not even appear to be a verbal tally between the opening verses.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
כי אני הכבדתי את לבו	51. Ex. 10:1	51. Ex. 10:1	<i>I Sam. 6:6-14</i>	<i>I Sam. 6:6-14</i>	<i>I Sam. 6:6-7:1</i>
עוד נגע אחד	52. Ex. 11:1	52. Ex. 11:1	Hag. 2:6-15, 23	Hag. 2:6-14, 23	Hag. 2:6-23
ויהי בחצי הלילה	<b>53. Ex. 12:29</b>	<b>53. Ex. 12:21</b> <sup>219</sup>	Is. 31:5-32:4, 8	Is. 21:11-16, 22:20-23	Is. 21:11-22:23
קדש לי כל בכור	54. Ex. 13:1	54. Ex. 13:1	Is. 46:3-5, 8-13, 47:4	Is. 46:3-13	Is. 46:3-13
מה תצק עלי	55. Ex. 14:15	55. Ex. 14:15	Is. 65:24-66:2, 5-10 <sup>222</sup>	Is. 65:24-66:10	Is. 65:24-66:24, 66:23
	<del>Ex. 16:4</del>	<b>56. Ex. 15:27</b> <sup>218</sup>	Jud. 1:16-23, 2:6-7 <sup>214</sup> <sup>223</sup>	<del>Is. 49:10-23</del>	
עד אנה מאנתם	56. Ex. 16:28	57. Ex. 16:28	Is. 58:13-59:7, 20	Is. 58:13-59:6, 20-21	Is. 58:13-59:21
וישמע יתרו	57. Ex. 18:1	58. Ex. 18:1	Is. 33:13-22	Is. 33:13-22	Is. 33:13-34:8, [35:4]
ואתם תהיו לי	<b>58. Ex. 19:6</b>	<b>59. Ex. 19:1</b> <sup>219</sup>	Is. 35:1-10	Is. 61:6-62:4	Is. 61:6-62:5
ואלה המשפטים	59. Ex. 21:1	60. Ex. 21:1	Is. 56:1-9, 57:19	Is. 56:1-8, 57:19	Is. 56:1-57:14
		<b>61. Ex. 21:28</b> <sup>218</sup>	Ez. 34:20-27, 30-31 <sup>214</sup>		
אם כסף תלוה	60. Ex. 22:24	62. Ex. 22:24	Is. 48:10-20	Is. 48:10-20	Is. 48:10-49:13
		<b>63. Ex. 23:20</b> <sup>224</sup>	Mal. 3:1-8, 23-24, 23 <sup>220</sup>		
ויקחו לי תרומה	61. Ex. 25:1	64. Ex. 25:1	Is. 60:17-61:3, 9	Is. 60:17-61:6	Is. 60:17-61:9
ואת המשכן תעשה	62. Ex. 26:1	65. Ex. 26:1	Is. 66:1-11	Is. 66:1-11	Is. 66:1-24, 23
ועשית פרכת	63. Ex. 26:31	66. Ex. 26:31	Ez. 16:10-18, 60	Ez. 16:10-19, 60	Ez. 16:10-29, 60
ואתה תצוה	64. Ex. 27:20	67. Ex. 27:20	Hos. 14:7-Joel 1:5, 2:14	Hos. 14:7-Joel 1:5, 2:14	Hos. 14:7-Joel 1:20, 2:14
לקדש אתם	65. Ex. 29:1	68. Ex. 29:1	Is. 61:6-62:5	Is. 61:6-62:5	Is. 61:6-62:5
ועשית מזבח	66. Ex. 30:1	69. Ex. 30:1	Mal. 1:11-2:7	Mal. 1:11-2:7	Mal 1:11-3:1
קראתי בשם בצלאל	67. Ex. 31:1	70. Ex. 31:1	Is. 43:7-15, 21	Is. 43:7-15	Is. 43:7-44:5

<sup>222</sup> Roth has 65:24-66:2, 5, but Mann has 65:24-66:2, 5-10 (I, 430). Based on Roth's methodology, he probably intended the latter and omitted the last part.

<sup>223</sup> Roth has 1:23-26, 2:6-7 in his list, but 1:16-23, 2:6-7 with his *aliyah* break-down. The latter has ten verses and tallies, so is likely the intended reading.

<sup>224</sup> This *seder* is not found in any *g'nizah* list or Yannai's *piyyutim*, but is found in the longer lists of *s'darim* of the Leningrad Codex. There is also evidence for it is found in the *midrashim* (see Mann I, 479-480).

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
ויפן וירד	68. Ex. 32:15	71. Ex. 32:15	II Sam. 22:10-18, 51	II Sam. 22:10-22, 51	II Sam. 22:10-51
		<b>72. Ex. 33:12<sup>225</sup></b>	Jer. 1:5-12, 2:2-3		
כתב לך	69. Ex. 34:27	73. Ex. 34:27	Jer. 31:32-39, 32:40-41	Jer. 31:32-39 {33-40}	Jer. 31:32-39 {33-40}
		<b>74. Ex. 35:30<sup>216</sup></b>	Is. 55:13-56:8, 57:15 <sup>226</sup>		
ויעש בצלאל את הארץ	70. Ex. 37:1	75. Ex. 37:1	I Kin. 8:8-15, 21-22	I Kin. 8:8-15, 21-22	I Kin. 8:8-30
אלה פקודי המשכן	71. Ex. 38:21	76. Ex. 38:21	Jer. 30:18-25, 31:7-8	Jer. 30:18-25, 31:7-8	Jer. 30:18-31:13 [14]
ויביאו את המשכן	72. Ex. 39:33	77. Ex. 39:33	Is. 33:20-34:4, 8	Is. 33:20-34:8, [35:10]	Is. 33:20-34:17, 35:10
ויקרא אל משה	73. Lev. 1:1	78. Lev. 1:1	Mic. 6:9-16, 7:7-8	Mic. 6:9-16, 7:7-8	Mic. 6:9-7:11, 18-20
נפש כי תחטא בשגגה	74. Lev. 4:1	79. Lev. 4:1	Ez. 18:4-13, 32	Ez. 18:4-13, 16-17	Ez. 18:4-32
נפש כי תחטא ושמעה	75. Lev. 5:1	80. Lev. 5:1	Zech. 5:3-11, 6:14	Zech. 5:3-11, 6:11-12	Zech. 5:3-6:12
זה קרבן אהרן	<b>76. Lev. 6:12</b>	<b>81. Lev. 6:1<sup>219</sup></b>	Mic. 6:6-8, 7:14-20	Mal. 3:4-11, 23	Mal 3:4-24, 23
		<b>82. Lev 7:11<sup>219</sup></b>	Hos. 14:3-10, Joel 4:16-17 <sup>227</sup>		
קח את אהרן	77. Lev. 8:1	83. Lev. 8:1	I Sam. 2:28-36, 3:20	I Sam. 2:28-35, 3:20	I Sam. 2:28-3:20
ויהי ביום השמיני	78. Lev. 9:1	84. Lev. 9:1	Ez. 43:27-44:5, 28-30	Ez. 43:27-44:5, 30	Ez. 43:27-44:20, 30
ייו ושכר אל תשת	79. Lev. 10:8	85. Lev. 10:8	Ez. 44:21-29, 45:15	Ez. 44:21-28, 46:3	Ez. 44:21-31, 46:3
זאת החיה	80. Lev. 11:1			Is. 40:16-21, 31	Is. 40:16-31
כי תזריע	81. Lev. 12:1	86. Lev. 12:1	Is 9:5-6, 11:1-9 <sup>228</sup>	Is. 66:7-13	Is. 66:7-24,23

<sup>225</sup> Although there is no *g'nizah*, *piyyut*, or Masoretic evidence for this *seder* and evidence in the Midrashim is scarce, Mann speculates that there was once a *seder* here. He also mentions and dismisses the possibility of it actually being the starting point for Shabbat Ḥol HaMoed Pesah instead (see Mann I, 524-525).

<sup>226</sup> Roth has 55:30-56:8, 57:15, but 55:30 does not exist. Mann has 55:13, and this was likely Roth's intention.

<sup>227</sup> Roth has this in his list (which follows Mann), but his detailed breakdown shows I Samuel 10:8-9, 17-24. It is unclear what the source would be for this.

<sup>228</sup> Mann gets Is. 9:5 via a list compiled by Dr. Israel Abrahams from the Cambridge Library *g'nizah* fragment collection, but I have not been able to find any such reference, nor, apparently, was Offer.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
כי יהיה בו נגע	82. Lev. 13:29	87. Lev. 13:29	Is. 7:20-8:3, 9:6	Is. 7:20-8:4, 9:6	Is. 7:20-8:4, 9:6
תורת המצרע	83. Lev. 14:1	88. Lev. 14:1	II Kin. 7:3-11, 8:4-5 <sup>220</sup>	Is. 57:17-58:8	Is 57:17-58:14
נגע צרעת	84. Lev. 14:33	89. Lev. 14:33	Is. 5:8-16, 6:3	Is. 5:8-16	Is. 5:8-6:3
כי יהיה זב מבשרו	85. Lev. 15:1	90. Lev. 15:1	Hos.6:1-11	Hos. 6:1-11, 10:12	Hos. 6:1-7:10, 10:12
ואשה כי יזוב זוב	86. Lev. 15:25	91. Lev. 16:1 <sup>219</sup>	Is. 6:1-8, 8:10-11 <sup>229</sup>	Ez 16:9-16:19, 16:60 <sup>230</sup>	Ez. 16:9-16:29, 16:60
ישחט שור או כשב	87. Lev. 17:1	92. Lev. 17:1	Is. 66:1-11 <sup>231</sup>	Is. 66:3-13	Is. 66:3-24, 23
כמעשה ארץ מצרים	88. Lev. 18:1			Jer. 10:2-10	Jer. 10:2-16
קדשים תהיו	89. Lev. 19:1	93. Lev. 19:1	Is. 4:3-5:5, 5:16	Is. 4:3-5:7, 5:16	Is. 4:3-5:16
ונטעתם כל עץ מאכל	90. Lev. 19:23	94. Lev. 19:23	Is. 65:22-66:2, 4-5, 10-11	Is. 65:22-66:2, 5-7, 10-11	Is. 65:22-66:22
אמר אל הכהנים	91. Lev. 21:1	95. Lev. 21:1	Ez. 44:25-45:2, 45:15	Ez. 44:25-31,45:9	Ez. 44:25-45:16
יקריב קרבנו	92. Lev 22:17	96. Lev. 22:1 <sup>218</sup>	Zech. 7:3-6, 8:16-23 <sup>214</sup>	Is. 56:7-57:4, 57:19	Is. 56:7-57:19
וקצרתם את קצירה	93. Lev. 23:9	97. Lev 23:1 <sup>218</sup>	Ez. 45:17, 46:1-9 <sup>214</sup>	Joel 4:13-21	Joel 4:13-21
		98. Lev. 24:1 <sup>216</sup>	Jer. 11:16-12:2, 15:15-16 <sup>217</sup>		
וכי תמכרו ממכר	94. Lev. 25:14	99. Lev. 25:14	Is. 24:2-8, 13-15	Is. 24:2-12, 25:8	Is. 24:2-23
וכי ימוך אחיך	95. Lev. 25:35			Is. 35:3-10	Is. 35:3-10
אם בחקתי תלכו	96. Lev. 26:3	100.Lev. 26:3	Is. 1:19-20, 24-27. 2:2-5	Is. 1:19-27, 2:2-3	Is. 1:19-2:11
כי יפלא נדר	97. Lev. 27:1			Jud. 11:30-40	Jud. 11:30-40
במדבר סיני	98. Num. 1:1	101.Num. 1:1	Hos. 2:16-25	Hos. 2:16-25	Hos. 2:16-25
איש על דגלו	99. Num. 2:1	102.Num. 2:1	Is. 55:13-56:8 <sup>220</sup>	Is. 49:6-18	Is. 49:6-26
ואלה תולדת אהרן	100.Num. 3:1	103.Num. 3:1	Is. 45:19-26:2, 13	Is 45:19-46:2, 13	Is. 45:19-46:13

<sup>229</sup> Roth's source for this *haftarah* is unclear. Mann reports that there is support in the *midrashim* for Is. 6:1 without elaborating, but does not provide any guess as to the remaining verses. It may be Roth's own speculation.

<sup>230</sup> Is. 4:4-5:7, 16 has more data than the Ezekiel passage (for which we only know the first verse), but then the same passage would be read twice in four weeks.

<sup>231</sup> Mann projected this backwards from a fragment with only 66:11, and seems to have guessed the wrong starting verse.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
		<b>104.Num. 3:40<sup>219</sup></b>	Is. 66:7-12, 20-23		
אל תכריתו	101.Num. 4:17	105.Num. 4:17	Zeph. 3:7-15, 20 <sup>220</sup>	Is. 48:9-19	Is. 48:9-49:7
כי תשטה אשתו	102.Num. 5:11	106.Num. 5:11	Hos. 4:14-5:4, 6:2	Hos. 4:14-5:4, 6:2	Hos. 4:14-6:2
כה תברכו	103.Num. 6:22	107.Num. 6:22	I Kings 8:54-63 <sup>232</sup>	Is. 44:3-11, 23	Is. 44:3-23
נשיא לבני אפרים	104.Num. 7:48	108.Num. 7:48	Jud. 5:14-22, 31 <sup>233</sup>	Jer. 31:19-25, 33 {20-26, 34}	Jer. 31:19-39 {20-40}
בהעלתך את הנרת	105.Num. 8:1	109.Num. 8:1	Zech. 4:2-9, 6:12-13 <sup>234</sup>	Zech. 4:2-11, 6:12	Zech. 4:2-14, 6:12
שתי חצוצרת	106.Num. 10:1	110.Num. 10:1	Is. 27:13-28:8, 16 <sup>232</sup>	Is. 27:13-28:8, 29:19	Is. 27:13-28:13, 29:19
אספה לי	107.Num. 11:16	111.Num. 11:16	Joel 2:16-24, 27 <sup>232</sup>	Is. 24:23-25:8	Is. 24:23-26:8
תקצר	<b>108.Num. 11:23</b>			Is. 59:1-10, 20-21	Is. 59:1-21
שלח לך אנשים	109.Num. 13:1	112.Num. 13:1	Josh 2:1-9, 23-24 <sup>235</sup>	Josh. 2:1-11	Josh. 2:1-24
עד אנה ינעצני	110.Num. 14:11	113.Num. 14:11	Is. 52:5-12, 54:7-8 <sup>236</sup>	Is. 52:5-12	Is. 52:5-12
ועשיתם אשה	111.Num. 15:1	114.Num. 15:1	Is. 56:3-8, 57:15-16, 18-19 <sup>236</sup>	Is. 56:3-57:5, 19	Is. 56:3-57:19
ויקח קרח	112.Num. 16:1	115.Num. 16:1	Hos. 10:2-12 <sup>237</sup>	Hos. 10:2-12	Hos. 10:2-11:8
וקח מאתם מטה מטה	113.Num. 17:16	116.Num. 17:16	Is. 11:1-10 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 11:1-12	Is. 11:1-12:6
ואל הלויים תדבר	114.Num. 18:25	117.Num. 18:25	Is. 62:8-63:3, 63:9 <sup>236</sup>	Is. 62:8-63:9	Is. 62:8-63:16
וישלח משה מלאכים	115.Num. 20:14	118.Num. 20:14	Jud. 11:12-21 <sup>238</sup>	Ob. 1:1-8, 21	Ob. 1:1-21

<sup>232</sup> Wacholder indicates that the only source for this *haftarah* is “unknown.” It was probably speculative.

<sup>233</sup> Wacholder indicates no sources for this *haftarah* at all!

<sup>234</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from a Yannai *piyyut*. The rest is Roth’s speculation.

<sup>235</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from Annual Cycle practices and “scholarly speculation” (possibly based on *midrashim*). The rest is Roth’s speculation.

<sup>236</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from *g’nizah* lists. The rest is Roth’s speculation.

<sup>237</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from a Yannai *piyyut* and Annual Cycle practices. The rest is Roth’s speculation.



Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
וירא בלק	116.Num. 22:2	119.Num. 22:2	Mic. 7:16-20, Nah 1:7, 2:1-3 <sup>239</sup>	Mic. 7:16-20	Mic. 7:16-20
מי מנה עפר יעקב	117.Num. 23:10	120.Num. 23:10	Is. 49:23-25, 50:4-10 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 49:23-50:6, 51:3	Is. 49:23-51:3
וישב ישראל בשטים	118.Num. 25:1			Joel 4:18-Amos 1:5, 3:7[-8]	Joel 4:18-Amos 2:3, 3:7-8
פינחס	119.Num. 25:10	121.Num. 25:10	Mal. 2:5-7, 3:1-6, 10 <sup>237</sup>	Mal. 2:5-12, 3:6-10	Mal. 2:5-3:10
		122.Num. 26:19 <sup>214</sup>	Josh. 14:6-15		
לאלה תחלק הארץ	120.Num. 26:52	123.Num. 26:52	Is. 57:13-19, 58:12-14 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 57:13-19, 58:14	Is. 57:13-58:14
יפקד	121.Num. 27:15	124.Num. 27:15	Josh. 13:7-14, 14:4-5 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 40:13-26, 31	Is. 40:13-31
וביום הבכורים	122.Num. 28:26	125.Num. 28:26	Mal. 3:4, 13-18, 22-24, 23 <sup>240</sup>	Mal. 3:4-12	Mal. 3:4-12
ראשי המטות	123.Num. 30:2	126.Num. 30:2	Is. 45:23-25, 46:3-5, 8-11 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 45:23-46:7, 13	Is. 45:23-46:13
נקם נקמת	124.Num. 31:1			Ez. 25:14-26:3,27:17	Ez. 25:14-26:16,27:17
	<del>Num. 31:25</del>	127.Num. 31:25	Is. 49:24-50:7 <sup>241</sup>	<del>Is. 49:24-50:3, 51:11</del>	
ומקנה רב	125.Num. 32:1	128.Num. 32:1	Josh. 22:8-12, 21-24, 26-27, 29 <sup>234</sup>	Josh. 22:8-14, 33	Josh. 22:8-33
מעסי בני ישראל	126.Num. 33:1	129.Num. 33:1	Is 11:16-12:6, 14:1-2 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 11:16-12:6	Is. 11:16-12:6
זאת הארץ	127.Num. 34:1	130.Num. 34:1	Ez. 45:1-8, 14-15 <sup>234</sup>	Ez. 45:1-8	Ez. 45:1-16
עברים את הירדן	128.Num. 35:9	131.Num. 35:9	Josh. 20:1-9, 21:3 <sup>234</sup>	Josh. 20:1-7	Josh. 20:1-7
אלה הדברים	129.Deut. 1:1	132.Deut. 1:1	Zech. 8:16-23, 9:9-10 <sup>234</sup>	Zech. 8:16-23, 10:1	Zech. 8:16-23, 10:1
רב לכם סב	130.Deut. 2:2	133.Deut. 2:2	Obad. 1:21, Mic. 3:9-4:5 <sup>234 242</sup>	Obad. 1:21-Jon. 1:9	Obad. 1:21-Jon. 1:16
ראה החלתי	131.Deut. 2:31	134.Deut. 2:31	Josh. 10:12-21 <sup>239</sup>	Josh. 10:12-21, 42	Josh. 10:12-42

<sup>238</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse based solely on Annual Cycle practice. The rest is Roth's speculation.

<sup>239</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from *g'nizah* lists and a Yannai *piyyut*. The rest is Roth's speculation.

<sup>240</sup> Wacholder determines the starting verse from "scholarly speculation" (possibly based on *midrashim*). The rest is Roth's speculation.

<sup>241</sup> Wacholder has "40:24", but quotes the opening words from "49:24." He bases this on *g'nizah* lists. The rest is Roth's speculation.

<sup>242</sup> Roth's speculation here is curious, as the skip seems unusually large (perhaps so much so as to be inconsistent with the Mishnah) and after only one verse.

Title	Our Seder	Roth Seder <sup>211</sup>	Roth Haftarah <sup>211</sup>	Our Short Haftarah	Our Long Haftarah
ואתחנן	132.Deut. 3:23	135.Deut. 3:23	Is. 33:2-6, 17, 19-22 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 33:2-10, 22	Is. 33:2-22
אז יבדיל משה	133.Deut. 4:41	136.Deut. 4:41	Josh. 20:8-21:8 <sup>234</sup>	Josh. 20:8-21:5, 43	Josh. 20:8-21:8, 43
שמע ישראל	134.Deut. 6:4	137.Deut. 6:4	Zech. 14:9-11, 16-21 <sup>239</sup>	Zech. 14:9-15, 21	Zech. 14:9-21
והיה עקב תשמעון	135.Deut. 7:12	138.Deut. 7:12	Is. 54:10-11, 55:6-13 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 54:10-17, 55:12-13	Is. 54:10-55:13
לרשת גוים	136.Deut. 9:1	139.Deut. 9:1	Josh. 1:10-18 <sup>240</sup>	Josh. 1:10-18, 3:7	Josh. 1:10-18, 3:7
פסל לך שני לוחת	137.Deut. 10:1	140.Deut. 10:1	I Kin. 8:9-18 <sup>240</sup>	I Kin. 8:9-20	I Kin. 8:9-20
כי הארץ	138.Deut. 11:10	141.Deut. 11:10	I Kin. 21:2-4, 7-8, 11-13, 17-18 <sup>214</sup>	Is. 30:23-29, 32:18	Is. 30:23-31:9, 32:18
כי ירחיב	139.Deut. 12:20	142.Deut. 12:20	Is. 54:2-9, 17 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 54:2-10, 17	Is. 54:2-17
בנים אתם	140.Deut. 14:1	143.Deut. 14:1	Is. 63:8-16, 65:9 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 46:3-13	Is. 46:3-13
כי יהיה בך אביון	141.Deut. 15:7	144.Deut. 15:7	Amos 8:4-10, 9:13-16 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 29:22-30:5, 30:18	Is. 29:22-30:18
שפטים ושטרים	142.Deut. 16:18	145.Deut. 16:18	Is. 56:1-9, 57:19 <sup>232</sup>	Is. 1:26-2:3	Is. 1:26-2:4
אשימה עלי מלך	<b>143.Deut. 17:14</b>	<b>146.Deut. 18:1<sup>218</sup></b>	Jer. 44:18-26 <sup>214</sup>	Is. 32:1-13, 18	Is. 32:1-20
כי תקרב אל עיר	144.Deut. 20:10	147.Deut. 20:10	Is. 66:12-22 <sup>236</sup>	Is. 66:12-23	Is. 66:12-23
קן צפור	145.Deut. 22:6	148.Deut. 22:6	Is. 31:5-9, 32:14-18 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 31:5-32:2,33:2	Is. 31:5-33:2
כי תצא מחנה	146.Deut. 23:10	149.Deut. 23:10	Is. 1:16-26 <sup>240</sup>	Is. 1:16-27	Is. 1:16-2:5
כי תדר נדר	<b>147.Deut. 23:22</b>	<b>150.Deut. 24:14<sup>218</sup></b>	Zech. 7:8-8:3 <sup>214</sup>	Is. 19:21-20:2, 22:21	Is. 19:21-20:6, 22:21
כי תקצר קצירך	<b>148.Deut. 24:19</b>			Hos. 10:12-11:3, 12:7	Hos. 10:12-12:7
כי תבוא אל הארץ	149.Deut. 26:1	151.Deut. 26:1	Ez. 44:30-45:8 <sup>240</sup>	Ez. 44:30-45:8	Ez. 44:30-45:8
אם שמוע תשמע	150.Deut. 28:1	152.Deut. 28:1	Is. 55:2-11 <sup>234</sup>	Is. 55:2-56:2	Is. 55:2-56:2
אתם נצבים	151.Deut. 29:9	153.Deut. 29:9	Josh. 24:1-8, 12:13 <sup>240</sup>	Josh. 24:1-13	Josh. 24:1-24
כי המצוה הזאת	<b>152.Deut. 30:11</b>			Is. 48:18-49:3, 49:13	Is. 48:18-49:13
הן קרבו ימיד	<b>153.Deut. 31:14</b>			I Kin. 2:1-12	I Kin. 2:1-12
האזינו השמים	154.Deut. 32:1	154.Deut. 32:1	Is. 1:2-9, 16-27 <sup>236</sup>	Is. 1:2-8, 2:3	Is. 1:2-26, 2:3
וזאת הברכה	155.Deut. 33:1	155.Deut. 33:1	Josh. 1:1-9	Josh 1:1-9	Josh 1:1-9

## ***Aliyah Breaks***

Another major task for a practical reading system is to divide each *seder* into seven *aliyot* (and a *maftir* which repeats some verses). The vast majority of the work for this has already been completed by Roth, and we will generally follow that wherever possible. We have made some slight adjustments and corrections to his divisions in just a few places, where either there seemed to be an error in his list or there was a more positive verse available for a beginning or ending.

This only leaves the few *s'darim* that we have chosen differently from Roth. In these cases, his divisions can still inform our choices, as can the divisions of the Annual Cycle (and the different rites thereof), both as they are divided on Shabbat and on weekdays. Of course, this will not cover all of the divisions necessary, and some new ones will need to be created following the halakhic considerations discussed above.

A number of the *s'darim* we need to divide are “short *s'darim*”, and the problem of how to handle them needs to be addressed. This category encompasses two scenarios. Some *s'darim* contain less than the 21 verses required for seven *aliyot* of three verses each. Others contain enough verses *per se*, but the *halakhot* of leaving no less than three verses at the start or end of a paragraph prevent their division into seven qualifying *aliyot*. While the Talmud suggests the possibility of splitting verses in half, the *halakhah*, as we have seen, allows only three full verses in an *aliyah*. Repeating verses, as we saw, is considered a last resort option.

Büchler theorized that perhaps originally each reader would read a single verse, and thus these short *s'darim* contain as few as seven verses, and, according to his theory, predate the Mishnah.<sup>243</sup> There is a small amount of support for this idea in the Bavli, which suggests that prior to Ezra, three verses of Torah were read by three readers, one per verse.<sup>244</sup> Nevertheless, it is clear from the sources that from the Mishnah onwards, the rabbinic understanding was that

---

<sup>243</sup> Büchler, 461.

<sup>244</sup> Talmud Bavli, Bava Kamma 82a.

there are a minimum of three verses per reader, and this is certainly what was codified as *halakhah*.

We have also seen that some other modern researchers have theorized that perhaps the practice in the historical cycle was to overrun the end of one week's *seder* and effectively go back a number of verses the following week. While an interesting theory, as we have seen, the Shulhan Arukh codifies the requirement to begin each week's Shabbat morning reading where the previous week's left off, and thus we must rule out solving the problem of short *s'darim* in this way due to the *halakhic* requirements. Since we have opted to retain the historical *seder* breaks, this leaves us only with our "last resort" option of repetition of verses, where we must attempt a solution where each *aliyah* has two new verses before resorting to more drastic measures. The divisions for all the *s'darim* can be found in the *humash* supplement which is accompanying this work.

One other question regarding the division of *aliyot* needs to be addressed: how to determine the three divisions which will be read on Shabbat afternoon, Monday and Thursday. As we have seen, these need to total ten or more verses (unless the *seder* itself is shorter!). In most cases, the first three divisions for the Shabbat morning reading of the *seder* will both provide enough verses and keep the duration of the reading short. In some cases, an extra verse will be necessary. The easiest solution would be to simply add the fourth *aliyah* division for Shabbat morning to the third; however, a knowledgeable individual could also simply add one or more verses to the last *aliyah* as long as it does not end within two verses of a paragraph break, and ideally not on a negative note either. At this time no effort has been made to incorporate this information in the divisions listed in the supplement.

### ***Calendar Considerations for Combining S'darim***

Having established our 155 *s'darim* (154 of which can fall on Shabbat), we must determine how to fit these to the calendar in a way that will be clear to those using the system. A look at the characteristics of the Jewish calendar will help us to understand the issues involved. One

year in the fixed Jewish calendar can last any of 353, 354, 355, 383, 384, or 385 days, and can only start on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday. Thankfully, all 24 permutations are not possible since, for instance, a year that begins on Monday cannot have 384 days or the next year would begin on a Sunday, which is not permitted. In fact, there are fourteen valid permutations. I have indicated them in the table below, along with information on the total number of Shabbatot on which there are no interruptions with and without Yom Tov Sheini:

**Table 9: Permutations of a Single Jewish Calendar Year**

#	Starts	Days	Available (No Yom Tov Sheini)	Avail. (Yom Tov Sheini)
1	Mon.	355	47	46
2	Mon	353	47	47
3	Tue	354	47	46
4	Thu	355	49	49
5	Thu	354	49	48
6	Sat	355	47	47
7	Sat	353	48	48
8	Mon	385	53	52
9	Mon	383	51	50
10	Tue	384	53	52
11	Thu	385	52	52
12	Thu	383	53	53
13	Sat	385	51	50
14	Sat	383	51	51

This basic information can then be extended to periods of three years. In any three-year period, there are either one or two “leap years,” and there can never be two in a row. This, along with the need for each year to start on a day that corresponds to the length of the previous year, and other calendar considerations, limits the number of possible three-year periods to 39 scenarios. These scenarios are listed in the table below:

**Table 10: Permutations of Three Jewish Calendar Years**

Year Types	Avail. (No YT Sheini)	<i>S'darim</i> to Combine (No YT Sheini)	Avail. (YT Sheini)	<i>S'darim</i> to Combine (YT Sheini)
1,14,4	147	7	146	8
1,14,5	147	7	145	9
1,13,7	146	8	144	10
1,6,12	147	7	146	8
1,7,10	148	6	146	8
2,11,5	148	6	147	7
2,4,10	149	5	148	6

2,5,8	149	5	147	7
3,6,11	146	8	145	9
3,6,12	147	7	146	8
3,13,6	145	9	143	11
3,13,7	146	8	144	10
4,3,13	147	7	145	9
4,10,1	149	5	147	7
5,1,13	147	7	144	10
5,1,14	147	7	145	9
5,8,1	149	5	146	8
5,9,6	147	7	145	9
5,8,2	149	5	147	7
5,2,11	148	6	147	7
6,12,3	147	7	146	8
6,5,8	149	5	147	7
6,5,9	147	7	145	9
6,11,5	148	6	147	7
7,3,13	146	8	144	10
7,10,1	148	6	146	8
8,1,7	148	6	146	8
8,2,5	149	5	147	7
8,1,14	151	3	149	5
8,2,11	152	2	151	3
8,2,4	149	5	148	6
9,6,5	147	7	145	9
9,6,11	150	4	149	5
9,6,12	151	3	150	4
10,1,6	147	7	145	9
10,1,14	151	3	149	5
10,1,13	151	3	148	6
10,1,7	148	6	146	8
11,5,2	148	6	147	7
11,5,8,	154	0	152	2
11,5,9	152	2	150	4
11,5,1	148	6	146	8
12,3,6	147	7	146	8
12,3,13	151	3	149	5
13,6,5	147	7	145	9
13,6,12	151	3	150	4
13,7,3	146	8	144	10
13,7,10	152	2	150	4
14,4,3	147	7	146	8
14,5,8	153	1	151	3

14,4,10	153	1	152	2
14,5,1	147	7	145	9

In a congregation where Yom Tov Sheini is not practiced, it is clear what to do in a three-year period that has the full 154 available Shabbatot, but the vast majority of three-year periods will have less, down to a possible 145. In a congregation that does observe Yom Tov Sheini, the maximal and minimal number of Shabbatot is two less at 152 and 143, respectively, since there will always be at least two Shabbatot in any three-year period that fall on Yom Tov Sheini. This means we need to be able to combine up to eleven pairs of *s'darim*.

There are two approaches to combining *s'darim*. One method would be to create a set of rules that fixes certain *s'darim* to certain points on the calendar, doubling up enough *s'darim* between the fixed points to get to them to fall on the right dates. This is similar to the method used in determining when *parashiyot* need to be combined in the Annual Cycle. Its primary advantages are keeping congregations who do and do not observe Yom Tov Sheini synchronized better and reducing the “drift” of certain *s'darim* (primarily towards the middle of the cycle) with regard to the time of year they can fall. Its main disadvantage is that it requires the user of the system to understand and apply the set of rules for which *s'darim* need to fall when and which *s'darim* to double to accomplish that.

The other approach would be to identify eleven pairs we want to combine, and then assign a priority (one through eleven) to each one. When any of these pairs is reached in the cycle, a quick look at a table showing the number of *s'darim* combined in the current three-year period would indicate whether or not to combine. This is the system Roth employs, albeit with only nine pairs of *s'darim*, as his system assumes one day of Yom Tov. The main advantage to this system is that every time a candidate for combination is reached, a quick determination as to whether or not to combine can be made quickly and easily, without regard to fitting other *s'darim* into the calendar. The primary disadvantages are that it will leave congregations that do and do not observe Yom Tov Sheini reading different *s'darim* more often than the first system and that a given *seder* could fall over a longer range of possible dates on the calendar, not tying it to a particular season.

Ease of use is a critical consideration, so the latter option has been chosen for this system. This also allows the system to be roughly consistent with Roth's system. Unfortunately, some of the *s'darim* that Roth indicates for combination are the non-historical ones that have been eliminated in this system, so some modification is needed. The eleven pairs of *s'darim* for combination in both systems are listed below, and have been marked with boxes around each pair on the table of *s'darim* above. A chart showing three-year periods and the number of double *s'darim* to use in each can be found in Appendix A of the *humash* supplement.

**Table 11: *S'darim* to Combine Based on Based on the Calendar**

In cycles when at least...	Our System	Roth System
1 must be combined	6 וזיכור &	33 ויוסף הורד מצרימה &
	7 צא מן התבה	34 חטאו משקה
2 must be combined	21 ואבא היום אל העין &	49 הנה יוצא המימה &
	22 ויסף אברהם	50 השכם בבקר
3 must be combined	28 כי שנואה לאה &	25 כי שנואה לאה &
	29 וישמע אליה	26 וישמע אליה
4 must be combined	23 ואלה תולדת יצחק &	20 ואלה תולדת יצחק &
	24 וזרע יצחק	21 וזרע יצחק
5 must be combined	56 עד אנה מאנתם &	57 עד אנה מאנתם &
	57 וישמע יתרו	58 וישמע יתרו
6 must be combined	25 ויהי כי זקן יצחק &	22 ויהי כי זקן יצחק &
	26 מטל השמים	23 מטל השמים
7 must be combined	16 ויבאו שני מלכים &	14 ויבאו שני מלכים &
	17 ויסע משם אברהם	15 ויסע משם אברהם
8 must be combined	62 ואת המשכן תעשה &	65 ואת המשכן תעשה &
	63 ועשית פרכת	66 ועשית פרכת
9 must be combined	83 תורת המצרע &	88 תורת המצרע &
	84 נגע צרעת	89 נגע צרעת
10 must be combined	136 לרשת גוים &	139 לרשת גוים &
	137 פסל לך שני לוחת	140 פסל לך שני לוחת
11 must be combined	91 אמר אל הכהנים &	95 אמר אל הכהנים &
	92 יקריב קרבנו	96 יקריב קרבנו



One other consideration for combining *s'darim* is how to divide the *aliyot* when combined. As before, this system will generally follow Roth's divisions. For the new combined *s'darim* that were not in Roth's system, the general principle will be that each *aliyah* of the combined *s'darim* will be equal to two from the uncombined ones. The only exception to this might be the middle *aliyah* in cases where the combination would permit us to start or end on a positive note where it was not possible as separate *s'darim*.

### *The Baraita of the Curses*

We have seen that one of the biggest open questions with regard to the historical cycle is its relationship with the *baraita* that claims that Ezra established that the two sets of curses be read before Shavuot and Rosh Hashanah. There are several ways to understand this *baraita*:

- **The curses were read as special readings on the Shabbatot immediately before these holidays in place of the normal readings.** This seems unlikely due to the lack of any representation in any lists of special Shabbatot over a period of many centuries and the objections in Old Cairo that the Sequential Triennial Cycle did not implement this practice. Additionally reading *only* the section of the curses on one Shabbat would appear to require its repetition for *every one* of the seven readings, which seems unlikely.
- **The curses were read as additional readings on the Shabbatot immediately before these holidays.** While this possibility eliminates the repetition problem, the other problems with the previous possibility all apply.
- **The Sequential Triennial Cycle was structured such that in some years the curses fell at these times.** This would be in keeping with Naeh's Septennial Cycle theory, and it is hard to see how it could work any other way. A cycle lasting only three years with the known *seder* divisions cannot fit the calendar in such a way as to make this occur. Naeh's two cycles of three and a half years each would allow this to occur. The

text of the *baraita* seems to suggest that the curses are to be read at these times every year, but certainly could be understood from cycle-centric perspective instead of calendar-centric perspective. Still, it seems unlikely that information on such a calendar alignment with the cycle would not be provided with more detail. In any case, this is not an option in our proposed cycle of exactly three years.

- **The *baraita* applied originally to an Annual Cycle that originated in Eretz Yisrael and when the Sequential Triennial Cycle emerged, it never conformed to it.** This follows Fleischer's theory on the origin of the two cycles. It seems unlikely, however, that a system that violated a decree attributed to Ezra was being practiced since Tannaitic times, and *nothing at all* was said about this in the rabbinic literature until Old Cairo in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.
- **The text is not an authentic *baraita* and originated in Babylonia where the Annual Cycle was the only cycle in practice and thus reflected that practice.** Certainly, as we have seen, a number of scholars have supported this theory, but this is, to some degree, an "easy way out." Declaring a problematic text as inauthentic so that its requirements may be ignored is not an appealing solution and a slippery slope. It is true, however, that it does not appear in the Y'rushalmi at all, particularly where we would expect to find it in the iteration of all of Ezra's decrees. The idea that it is, in fact, a polemic against the Sequential Triennial Cycle is an interesting idea, but we see no other evidence of any negativity towards the Sequential Triennial Cycle until the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and we might expect to find this in the Bavli's discussion of the *baraita* (which is mainly focused on the purpose of reciting the curses at these times).

These last two possibilities would mean that the *baraita* was completely inoperative on the historical Sequential Triennial Cycle, and that for a great number of centuries, the authorities had no objections at all to its existence. This would give us a reasonable precedent to restore the practice of the Sequential Triennial Cycle with no regard for the *baraita* at all. On the other hand, even though the Shulḥan Arukh does not codify this *baraita*, it is halakhically concerning

to ignore a decree attributed to Ezra. As a result, we will suggest that the curses could be read as *additional* readings on the same Shabbatot on which they are read in the Annual Cycle (conforming to the *baraita*'s requirements). As noted, this may not have been the historical practice, but it certainly solves the problem of complying with the *baraita*. It will be left to each congregation's halakhic authority to decide whether or not to implement this annual reading of each set of curses. (There should be no need to read the curses as an additional reading in the third year of the cycle where the Deuteronomy curses will fall before Rosh Hashanah in any case).

### *Simḥat Torah*

Since the reading cycle only completes once every three years, it would be inappropriate to observe Simḥat Torah during the first two years of the cycle. The day commonly called Simḥat Torah would remain Sh'mini Atzeret, with all of the practices normally associated with that Yom Tov, but there would be no *hakafot*, and there would be no ritual for completing and restarting the Torah from its beginning. This raises the question of what the Torah and *haftarah* readings for this day should be. Luckily, since Simḥat Torah did not exist, as such, during the Amoraic period, the Talmud provides us with an answer in the form of what was read on that day in that time period, and this is another historical practice that can be given a new life.

In the Tannaitic period (where there was only one day of Yom Tov), it appears from the Mishnah<sup>245</sup> and Tosefta<sup>246</sup> that the reading began at Numbers 29:35. This almost certainly continued only to Numbers 30:1, the conclusion of that paragraph. This is still in use today as the *maftir* reading for both days of Sh'mini Atzeret. There are only six verses in the paragraph, so for the five readings (or seven on Shabbat), the same two groups of three verses would need to be read repeatedly (and repeated *again* for the Maftir). This does not seem like a desirable practice to restore, and, in any case, there is no need to rely on it as we know the practice changed.

---

<sup>245</sup> Mishnah Megillah 3:6.

<sup>246</sup> Tosefta Megillah 3:3.

As we saw, the Bavli indicates that the Torah reading for the second day of Sh'mini Atzeret (in the Diaspora) is Deuteronomy 33:1 (“*v'zot ha-b'rakhah...*”). While, as we noted, there may be some question as to whether this was a later emendation to the Talmud reflecting the practice of Simḥat Torah, there is also logic to it being read as the reading for that Yom Tov independently of finishing the Torah on this day. Because of this, and because no other historical precedent presents itself, we will assume this was indeed the practice during that time period. This is particularly convenient since it is what congregations that follow the Annual Cycle will be reading for the primary Torah reading on that day. Using it as an “ordinary” Torah reading requires the portion to be divided such that there are five *aliyot* on weekday Yom Tov and seven *aliyot* when it falls on Shabbat (which can only occur in congregations that do not observe Yom Tov Sheini). The proposed divisions below are based on the Simḥat Torah divisions, with combined *aliyot* to reduce the count. The division also conforms to the halakhic requirement of not splitting the final eight verses. When reading this portion and it is not Simḥat Torah, this portion is not part of the weekly reading cycle, and it is *not* appropriate to stand and recite “*ḥazak, ḥazak*” as is the custom when completing a book of the Torah.

The same *baraita* from the Bavli gives a Torah reading for the first day of Sh'mini Atzeret as starting somewhere in the vicinity of Deuteronomy 15 (it is worded inconclusively). This seems to have superseded the repeated reading of the Numbers passage as the main reading for the day. It could be argued that congregations observing only one day of Yom Tov should use this reading for Sh'mini Atzeret when it is not Simḥat Torah. It seems preferable, however, to read what has become the custom in such congregations on that day and read the passage starting in Deuteronomy 33. A congregation wishing to follow the historical practice could easily do so using the divisions for the first day in the Diaspora.

We saw previously that the Bavli specifies the *haftarah* for the second day as starting at I Kings 8:22, without specifying its extent. The Romaniote practice for this day is documented as

starting at that verse and extending the *haftarah* to either 8:34 or 8:53.<sup>247</sup> The first endpoint provides a twelve verse *haftarah*, and the second a 32 verse *haftarah* that, in congregations observing Yom Tov Sheini, completely bridges the gap between the *haftarot* for the second day of Sukkot and the first day of Sh'mini Atzeret (albeit reading the passages out of order). These are both clearly a historical practice, and may go back even further to the Amoraic practice. They also work aesthetically, and so we will adopt the former as the “short” *haftarah* and the latter as the “long” *haftarah*.

Yannai’s *k’rovah* for the only day of Sh’mini Atzeret in Eretz Yisrael cites I Kings 8:66, which, in mentioning the eighth day, is certainly appropriate, but it is hard to see how it would provide an appropriate reading if the *haftarah* were to *begin* there. No other source indicates this, so one might conclude that in this instance Yannai used the *last* verse of the *haftarah* instead of the first, which would then match well with *g’nizah* fragments that show the *haftarah* for the only day in Eretz Yisrael ending at 8:66.<sup>248</sup> The only fragment showing a starting point<sup>249</sup> has 8:54, which matches exactly with the aforementioned *baraita* in the Bavli indicating the reading for the first day, and this is indeed the practice in the Annual Cycle today outside of Eretz Yisrael. It seems a reasonable conclusion based on the sources that the *haftarah* for the only day in Eretz Yisrael was I Kings 8:54-66 before it was supplanted by the observance of Simḥat Torah. Thus, it seems congregations which observe one day of Yom Tov should use this *haftarah*.

**Table 12: Torah Divisions for the Last Day of Sh'mini Atzeret When it is Not Simḥat Torah**

	Weekday	Shabbat
1	Deuteronomy 33:1-7	Deuteronomy 33:1-7
2	Deuteronomy 33:8-12	Deuteronomy 33:8-12
3	Deuteronomy 33:13-17	Deuteronomy 33:13-17
4	Deuteronomy 33:18-26	Deuteronomy 33:18-21
5	Deuteronomy 33:27-34:12	Deuteronomy 33:22-26
6	N/A	Deuteronomy 33:27-29

<sup>247</sup> Shlomo Yosef Zevin, *Encyclopedia Talmudit*, Vol. 10, Talmudic Encyclopedia Institute: Jerusalem, 1961, 721-722.

<sup>248</sup> T-S A42.2, T-S B17.11

<sup>249</sup> T-S B17.11

7	N/A	Deuteronomy 34:1-12
Maf.	Numbers 29:35-30:1	Numbers 29:35-30:1
Haf. (1 day Yom Tov)	I Kings 8:54-66	I Kings 8:54-66
Haf. (2 days Yom Tov)	I Kings 8:22-53 (8:22-34 short)	I Kings 8:22-53 (8:22-34 short)

In locations where there are other congregations nearby and there is another congregation that observes Simḥat Torah every year, it is recommended for congregations using the Sequential Triennial Cycle to join such a congregation for its Simḥat Torah celebration instead of holding its own service with the above readings. The precedent for this is the well-documented practice in Old Cairo where this was the regular practice in the two congregations there.<sup>250</sup> Once again, we have an opportunity to revive a historical practice, and, in this case, doing so helps to bring together different segments of the Jewish community to celebrate on Yom Tov.

### *Obstacles to Switching to this Cycle*

There are a number of concerns that may be raised in communities considering switching to using the Sequential Triennial Cycle (whether it is the system implemented here or the similar Roth system):

- **All Jewish congregations will no longer be reading the same words from the Torah on the same Shabbat.** This is not quite technically true, as even in the Annual Cycle, on years when the eighth day of Pesah or second day of Shavuot fall on Shabbat, those who observe Yom Tov Sheini and those who do not are not reading the same *parashah*. When this occurs, they do not resynchronize for a number of weeks. Nevertheless, this is an undeniable consequence of using the Sequential Triennial Cycle. It is, however, not a new problem, as we know that this was the norm for many centuries – in fact, the evidence points to the different communities using the Sequential Triennial Cycle being out of sync with each other as well. As more congregations adopt the Sequential Triennial Cycle and it becomes more familiar to the Jewish world, this will seem like less of a departure from the current norm. If a congregation

---

<sup>250</sup> See footnote 98 above.

seeks to have a shorter Shabbat morning Torah reading than the Annual Cycle allows, then being out of sync with the Annual Cycle is effectively the trade-off for using a system that meets all halakhic requirements.

- **By using the Sequential Triennial Cycle, a congregation is unnecessarily dividing the Jewish community.** This builds upon the previous concern, but also suggests the halakhic principle of **לֹא תתגדדו** – effectively, not to create factions within a community. This would require a fairly broad interpretation of this principle and the meaning of community. It is certainly arguable whether or not different congregations are considered the same community. It is plainly obvious that the Jewish world is already divided in many, many practices between different congregations, with differences ranging from minor to major. There are several other Torah reading systems already in use in the world, the most prominent of which is the American Conservative Movement's Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle. Adding another alternative to this which is more halakhically compliant and which restores a historical practice that was a well-established *minhag* attested to in the Talmud (perhaps arguably) does not make the current state of affairs worse.
- **People will not be able to read their *b'nei mitzvah* Torah/*haftarah* portions every year.** It is certainly true that the Torah portion will now come up only every three years (portions for special occasions aside). This would be true in the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle too. Many of the Annual Cycle *haftarot*, however, also appear (at least in part) in the Sequential Triennial Cycle, and in many cases, multiple times in the cycle, offering the opportunity for people to read familiar portions. Additionally, around a third of all the *haftarot* read on Shabbat during the year are special *haftarot* determined by the calendar, and those will continue to be read every year in the same pattern as the Annual Cycle. The shorter *haftarot* (and *aliyot*, when compared to the Annual Cycle) generally will make it easier for someone who has learned a Torah/*haftarah* portion previously to learn a new one, which is probably more desirable

than reading the same thing once a year in any case. It would also make the *b'nei mitzvah* portions all the more significant events when they come around in the cycle, much like Simḥat Torah.

- **The Shabbatot on the calendar are named for the Annual Cycle portions and used as a general reference point.** This is true, but among congregations that use the Sequential Triennial Cycle, the name from this cycle can be used in the same way. There will be a disconnect between people using the two cycles, but realistically, most people who use the Sequential Triennial Cycle and also understand what someone means when they refer to a Shabbat by its *parashah* name will be at least generally aware of what is being read in the Annual Cycle, and certainly will have simple means to look up when a *parashah* is read in the Annual Cycle. The evidence suggests that historically, users of the Sequential Triennial Cycle used names to refer to the *s'darim*, so this would again be nothing new.
- **When attending different congregations there will be different Torah readings and, someone who does this will not hear parts of the Torah read during the cycle.** As noted before, this is already an occasional problem when going from a congregation that observes Yom Tov *sheini* to one that does not or vice-versa, but implementing this system will certainly exacerbate the problem. Using any system that shortens the Torah reading will necessarily have this problem, but instead of institutionalizing the problem so it happens to everyone in such a congregation every week, this system limits it to only those who attend different congregations. A logical work-around for this problem would be for the individual to read the Torah portion the “home” congregation is reading on his or her own during the week, which would also be consistent with the practice of **שניים מקרא ואחד תרגום** (studying the week’s portion twice in Hebrew and once in the Aramaic translation).
- **To determine the correct practice we see what people are doing, and congregations not using the Annual Cycle are using the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle.**



This is invoking the halakhic principle of פוק חזי “go out and see”— when two rabbis in the Talmud disagree on the *halakhah*, the “tie-breaker” is what people are actually doing.<sup>251</sup> It is not clear whether this is a situation where this principle applies, as a decision is not being made regarding two possibilities where it is unknown which one is the accepted *halakhah*. We already know that the Sequential Triennial Cycle complies with all the halakhic requirements and the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle only complies with some of them (nevertheless, it was approved by at least one organization as halakhically valid). In any case, this line of reasoning to defend the Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle is somewhat hypocritical, as even 30 years ago, one would not have found it to be the case that many Conservative congregations were using this system. Thus, by the same reasoning, no one should have switched to that system, but clearly quite a few congregations did. The current scenario would seem to be no different.

- **Implementing this system is changing the *minhag* of the congregation.** A congregation changing from the Annual Cycle to *any* shorter reading system is doing this. A congregation that is switching from another shorter reading system to the Sequential Triennial Cycle has likely already done this once. It can also be argued whether non-sequential systems have any validity as a *minhag* at all, having no origin in the Talmud and being in conflict with the halakhic sources from the Tannaitic period to the Shulhan Arukh and beyond. Additionally, as we have seen, the Sequential Triennial Cycle has a number of advantages over other systems, and it can certainly be argued that using this system will enhance congregants’ understanding and engagement with the Torah portion, and as such, *talmud Torah* is certainly a goal which can be weighed against a change in *minhag ha-makom*.

---

<sup>251</sup> See Talmud Bavli B’rakhot 45a, for example.

### *Towards the Future of the Sequential Triennial Cycle*

This work and its accompanying *humash* supplement are not intended to be the final word on the Sequential Triennial Cycle, but it is hoped that they will be a significant stepping stone towards its practical use and implementation in synagogues. It is hoped that more information will come to light on its historical practice, particularly with regard to the extent and skipping in the *haftarot* and using a consistent set of *s'darim* and *haftarot* that reflect the practice of a single historical place and time. If so, then it is also my hope that I or someone who will succeed me will update the system to better reflect the historical data. Additional information regarding the handling of the short *s'darim* could also have an impact on the system.

On a more mundane level, this system and the historical data amassed here involves a great deal of detail, and it is almost inevitable that there is an unnoticed typo or other error somewhere in the reference materials and verse breakdowns. It is my hope to make much of this material available to the public via the Internet and published volumes of the *humash* supplement. In doing this, users of the system will be encouraged to report such errors so that they can be corrected in the reference materials and future editions of the supplement.

Additionally, it would be reasonable for the assumptions used in creating this system to be questioned. Though there is still debate about the fixing of the historical Sequential Triennial Cycle to the calendar, it is reasonably clear that it was read in most or all places and times over a period of more than three years. A strong argument could be made that any implementation of the Sequential Triennial Cycle should match this historical implementation instead of being fixed to the calendar at three years. This would not so much be a halakhic argument as one to preserve the authenticity of the practice as much as possible. Similarly, it would be a reasonable argument to interrupt the cycle on all the days specified in the Tosefta or Mishnah rather than the smaller set used today in the Annual Cycle. If a move towards this increased historicity is desired, I cannot see any objection to it, as long as the trade-offs are understood.

The system, as presented here, makes for a practical modern implementation of the Sequential Triennial Cycle that meets the *halakhic* requirements. It builds on Rabbi Simchah Roth's attempt at the same, and in doing so works within constraints that force the modern system to vary in some its attributes from the historical ones. Nevertheless, this system is more historically accurate than Roth's was. The inclusion of the supplement also transforms the *haftarah* list from a theoretical practice into one that can be practically implemented in real-world congregations. It is hoped that congregations of all types will study the Sequential Triennial Cycle, and some will adopt it instead of the halakhically questionable and non-historical Non-Sequential Triennial Cycle.

## Index

Bomberg Bible, 60, 61, 66, 87, 101, 124

curses, 5

*baraita* of, 11, 18, 67, 74, 80, 91, 93, 95, 96,  
97, 98, 102, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112,  
144, 145, 146

division of, 18, 28

Damascus Keter, 60, 64, 65, 66, 101, 124

Fustat. See Old Cairo

*hakhel*, 4, 102, 110, 111

interruptions to reading cycle, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19,  
26, 27, 30, 80, 84, 91, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100,  
103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112,  
115, 144

Karaite rite, 36, 58, 71

Old Cairo, 43, 68, 69, 71, 89, 98, 102, 103, 105,  
110, 112, 113, 115, 144, 145, 149

*p'tihta*, 75, 76, 78, 79

positive note, starting and ending a reading on,  
28, 30, 57, 67, 70, 81, 85, 87, 88, 94, 96, 99,  
113

Romaniote rite, 36, 58, 71, 147

Rosh Hodesh, 9, 13, 24, 27, 79, 103, 104, 107,  
108, 111

*s'darim*

list of 141, 60, 64, 65, 97, 98, 107, 111

list of 154, 60, 70, 75, 84, 85, 94, 97, 98, 111,  
112, 114

list of 167, 60, 97, 98, 104, 107, 109, 111

short, 39, 40, 48, 70, 75, 84, 85, 87, 94, 98,  
99, 113, 117, 125, 138, 139, 153

Septennial Cycle, 42, 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 104,  
107, 109, 110, 111, 144

Simhat Torah, 14, 42, 43, 68, 69, 89, 92, 94, 98,  
114, 115, 146, 147, 149

skipping in *haftarah*, 14, 15, 16, 18, 31, 48, 56,  
57, 66, 70, 77, 78, 89, 96, 112, 123

skipping in Torah, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 26, 30,  
86, 87, 88, 90, 93, 123

Yannai, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 47, 57, 59, 64, 65,  
66, 74, 83, 84, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136,  
148