

**The Soncino Babylonian Talmud**



# SUCCAH

**Book II**

**Folios 29b-56b**

**TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH WITH NOTES**

**CHAPTERS III - V**

*Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771*

**[www.613etc.com](http://www.613etc.com)**

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

## Sukkah 29b

on account of those who had the power to protest [against wrongdoing] and did not protest; and on account of those who publicly declare their intention to give specified sums for charity and do not give.

Rab said, On account of four things is the property of householders confiscated by the state treasury:<sup>1</sup> On account of those who defer payment of the laborer's hire; on account of those who withhold the hired laborer's wages; on account of those who remove the yoke from off their necks and place it on [the necks] of their fellows<sup>2</sup> and on account of arrogance. And the sin of arrogance is equivalent to all [the others] whereas of the humble it is written, But the humble shall inherit the land, and delight themselves in the abundance of peace.<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER III

**MISHNAH.** A STOLEN OR A WITHERED PALM-BRANCH<sup>4</sup> IS INVALID. ONE [THAT CAME] FROM AN ASHERAH<sup>5</sup> OR FROM A CONDEMNED CITY,<sup>6</sup> IS INVALID. IF ITS TOP WAS BROKEN OFF OR ITS LEAVES WERE DETACHED,<sup>7</sup> IT IS INVALID. IF ITS LEAVES ARE MERELY SPREAD APART<sup>8</sup> IT IS VALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, HE SHOULD TIE THEM UP AT THE TOP. THE THORN-PALMS OF THE IRON MOUNTAIN<sup>9</sup> ARE VALID.<sup>10</sup> A PALM-BRANCH WHICH IS THREE HANDBREADTHS IN LENGTH, LONG ENOUGH TO WAVE, IS VALID.

**GEMARA.** [The Tanna]<sup>11</sup> categorically teaches [that the PALMBRANCH IS INVALID] irrespective of whether [it is to be used] on the first day of the Festival<sup>12</sup> or on the second day.<sup>13</sup> Now this is right as regards a withered palm since we must have [a branch that is] 'goodly'<sup>14</sup> which this one is not; but with regard to a stolen one, the law is quite right as far as the first day

of the Festival is concerned, since it is written, 'to you'<sup>14</sup> [which implies that it shall be] of your own, but why should it not be allowed on the second day?<sup>15</sup> —

R. Johanan answered in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai,

- (1) For the fiscus.
- (2) The reference is to those who evade payment of taxes, so that the burden falls more heavily on others.
- (3) Ps. XXXVII, 11.
- (4) Lulab, one of the four species used in the festive wreath (cf. Lev. XXIII, 40).
- (5) A grove worshipped by heathens (cf. Deut. XII, 2).
- (6) Cf. Deut. XIII, 16.
- (7) From the stem.
- (8) But are joined to the stem at their roots.
- (9) A mountain in the vicinity of Jerusalem.
- (10) Though their leaves are short.
- (11) In our Mishnah.
- (12) When the obligation is Pentateuchal.
- (13) On which the obligation is only Rabbinical.
- (14) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (15) To which the text cited, which explicitly refers to the first day, does not apply.

## Sukkah 30a

because it<sup>1</sup> would be a precept fulfilled through a transgression [which is forbidden], as it is said, And ye have brought that which is stolen, and the lame and the sick,<sup>2</sup> 'The stolen' is thus compared with the lame; just as the lame can never be rectified,<sup>3</sup> so that which is stolen can never be rectified, [that is] irrespective of whether the stolen is used before abandonment [of hope of recovery by the owner] or after abandonment. Now this<sup>4</sup> is right before abandonment, since the Divine Law said, When any man of you bringeth an offering unto the Lords<sup>5</sup> and this<sup>6</sup> is not his, but [why should the law apply] after abandonment [of right by the owner], seeing [that the robber] has acquired it<sup>7</sup> by [virtue of that] abandonment?<sup>8</sup> The reason must then be that it is a precept fulfilled through a transgression.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai further said, What is the purport of that which is written, For I the Lord love justice, I hate robbery with iniquity?<sup>9</sup> This may be compared to a human king who passed through his custom-house and said to his attendants, ‘pay the tax<sup>10</sup> to the tax-collectors’. They said to him, ‘But the whole tax, surely, belongs to thee!’ He answered them, ‘All travelers would learn from me not to evade their payments of tax’. So the Holy One, blessed be He, said, ‘I the Lord hate robbery in burnt-offerings;<sup>11</sup> let My children learn from Me and keep away from robbery’.<sup>12</sup> So<sup>13</sup> it was also stated: R. Ammi said, A withered [palm-branch] is invalid because it is not ‘goodly’,<sup>14</sup> a stolen one is invalid because it constitutes a precept fulfilled through a transgression. And this<sup>15</sup> disagrees with R. Isaac, since R. Isaac b. Nahmani said in the name of Samuel, This<sup>16</sup> was taught only with regard to the first day of the Festival, but on the second day, since a man fulfills his obligation with a borrowed [palm-branch],<sup>17</sup> he fulfills it also with a stolen one.

R. Nahman b. Isaac objected: A **STOLEN OR WITHERED PALM-BRANCH IS INVALID**, from which it follows that a borrowed one is valid? Now when?<sup>18</sup> If you say, On the first day of the Festival, is it not written [it may be objected] ‘to you’<sup>19</sup> implying that it should be your own, and this one is not his! Consequently the reference must be to the second day of the Festival, and yet it teaches that a stolen one is invalid?<sup>20</sup> —

Raba replied: Indeed it refers to the first day of the Festival but he<sup>21</sup> implies the form of ‘It is not required’:<sup>22</sup> It is not required to state that a borrowed one is invalid since it is not his; but in the case of a stolen one, of which I might say that normally a robbery [implies immediate] abandonment by its owner and that it is, therefore, like his

own,<sup>23</sup> therefore he informs us [that even a stolen one is invalid].<sup>24</sup>

R. Huna said to some traders, When you purchase myrtles from heathens,<sup>25</sup> do not cut them yourselves, but let them<sup>26</sup> cut them and give them to you. What is the reason? — Heathens as a rule acquire their land by robbery<sup>27</sup>

- (1) The use of a stolen palm-branch.
- (2) Mal. 1, 13.
- (3) To become a valid offering.
- (4) That the stolen may not be used.
- (5) Lev. I, 2. The Heb. for ‘of you’ may be rendered ‘of yours’. sc. the offering must come from the donor's own property.
- (6) Being a stolen one.
- (7) The stolen.
- (8) V. B.K. 67a.
- (9) Isa. LXI. 8.
- (10) For the king's own goods.
- (11) Be'olah. E.V. ‘with iniquity’. The noun may bear both significations.
- (12) Even although everything belongs to God, and there can, therefore, technically be no robbery in offering a sacrifice to God.
- (13) That the reason for the first ruling in our Mishnah is, as R. Johanan explained, that a pious deed may not be performed through a transgression.
- (14) Cf. Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (15) The ruling that a stolen palm-branch is invalid on the second day of the Festival.
- (16) That a stolen palm-branch is invalid.
- (17) As was explained supra 29b ad fin.
- (18) Is it valid.
- (19) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (20) How then could R. Isaac b. Nahmani maintain in the name of Samuel that it is valid?
- (21) The author of our Mishnah.
- (22) A statement which mentions only the less probable, and includes the more probable.
- (23) Even if the owner was not heard to abandon it.
- (24) Unless the owner had actually abandoned the hope of ever recovering it.
- (25) For binding to the palm-branch. V. infra.
- (26) The heathens.
- (27) From Jews.

## Sukkah 30b

and there is no [title to] land by robbery;<sup>1</sup> therefore let them cut it down, so that there may be abandonment [of right]<sup>2</sup> by the

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

owner while it is in their possession,<sup>3</sup> and change of domain<sup>4</sup> in your hands.<sup>5</sup> But in any case, even when the traders cut the myrtles, let abandonment [of right] by the owner take place when these are in their hands, and change of domain when they are in the hands of the purchasers?<sup>6</sup> — It is necessary [to state this law] only with regard to the Hoshanna<sup>7</sup> of the traders themselves.<sup>8</sup> But why could they not acquire possession of them by the change they make in it?<sup>9</sup> —

[R. Huna] is of the opinion that the palm-branch [wreath] does not need binding;<sup>10</sup> and [even] if you were to find some ground for saying that the palm-branch wreath does need binding, [still] the change would be one that can be removed by restoring the object to its original condition<sup>11</sup> which is not regarded as a valid change. But why should they not acquire possession by virtue of the change of name, since previously<sup>12</sup> it was called asa [myrtle] and now

(1) Lit., ‘land cannot be robbed’; v. B.K. 117b. The myrtle while still growing is, therefore, legally the property of its Jewish owner and thus invalid to the purchaser.

(2) Of the cut myrtles.

(3) Unlike land, detached produce is acquired by robbery.

(4) From that of the seller to that of the buyer.

(5) He is of the opinion that abandonment of right by the owner is not sufficient to constitute acquirement of title by the possessor unless there was in addition either (a) a change of domain, (b) a change in the nature of the object, or (c) a change in its name (v. B.K. 67a). But even if abandonment alone were sufficient, the robbery, if the traders themselves had cut the myrtles, would have been committed by them, and they would have been guilty of performing a precept by means of a transgression.

(6) Lit., ‘in our hands’. And since the purchasers commit no robbery they might well use the myrtles.

(7) The myrtle. Lit., ‘save, we beseech thee’, a refrain chanted when holding the wreath of which the myrtles form a part.

(8) Which they require for their own use. In such a case, were they to cut the myrtles, there

would be no change of domain and they (the users) would be committing the robbery.

(9) By binding the three components, the myrtles, the willows and the palm-branch.

(10) Hence there is no change.

(11) He may unbind the component parts.

(12) Before it was put into the festive wreath.

## Sukkah 31a

Hoshanna?<sup>1</sup> — Previously also a myrtle<sup>2</sup> was called Hoshanna.<sup>1</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, In the case of a stolen Sukkah, and [a Sukkah made by] placing Sukkah-covering over a public thoroughfare,<sup>3</sup> R. Eliezer declares [them] invalid and the Sages declare [them] valid. R. Nahman explained: The dispute<sup>4</sup> applies only where he<sup>5</sup> forcibly ejects his fellow<sup>6</sup> from the Sukkah. In which case R. Eliezer<sup>7</sup> is consistent with his view, he having said, ‘A man cannot fulfill his obligation in the Sukkah of his fellow’, so that if [we hold that] there is a title to land by robbery, the Sukkah is a stolen one,<sup>8</sup> and even if [we hold that] there is no title to land by robbery,<sup>9</sup> [still] the Sukkah is a borrowed one;<sup>10</sup> and the Rabbis<sup>11</sup> [also] are consistent, since they maintain that a man can fulfill his obligation in the Sukkah of his fellow, and that there is title to land by robbery, so that the Sukkah is a borrowed one.<sup>12</sup> Where, however, he stole wood and used it for Sukkah-covering, all agree<sup>13</sup> that he [the owner] has [a claim] merely against the cost of the wood.<sup>14</sup> How [do we know this]?<sup>15</sup> —

Since [the Sukkah] is compared to a public thoroughfare;<sup>16</sup> as the ground of a public thoroughfare is not his,<sup>17</sup> so [must] the Sukkah [referred to] also be one put up on land that is not his.<sup>18</sup> A certain old woman<sup>19</sup> came before R. Nahman and said to him, ‘The Exilarch and all the Rabbis of the house of the Exilarch are sitting in a stolen Sukkah’. She cried<sup>20</sup> but R. Nahman took no notice of her. She said to him, ‘A woman whose father<sup>21</sup> had three hundred and eighteen slaves cries out to you, and you

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

take no notice?’ R. Nahman said to them, ‘She is a noisy woman; but she can claim only the cost of the wood’.<sup>22</sup>

Rabina said, If the main joist of a Sukkah was stolen,<sup>23</sup> the Rabbis made an enactment with regard to it,<sup>24</sup> similar to the enactment of the beam.<sup>25</sup> But is not this<sup>26</sup> obvious? Wherein does it differ from wood?<sup>27</sup> — I would have thought that [the law applied only to] wood since it is common,<sup>28</sup> but not to this which is uncommon,<sup>29</sup> therefore he informs us [that the law applies to this case also]. This,<sup>30</sup> however, only applies during the seven days [of the Festival], but after the seven days, it must be returned in its original state. If, however, he fixed it in with cement,<sup>31</sup> even after the seven days he need only give its value.

A Tanna taught, A withered [palm-branch] is invalid; R. Judah declares it valid. Raba said, The dispute concerns only the palm-branch, since the Rabbis are of the opinion that the palm-branch is likened to the Ethrog [citron], and just as the Ethrog must be a goodly [fruit]<sup>32</sup> so must the palm-branch be goodly, while R. Judah holds that we do not liken the palm-branch to the Ethrog; but with regard to the Ethrog, all agree that it must be a goodly [fruit].<sup>32</sup> Does not then R. Judah demand that the palm-branch shall be goodly? Have we not in fact learnt, R. JUDAH SAYS, HE SHOULD TIE THEM UP AT THE TOP, the reason presumably being that it must be goodly?—

No! The reason is as it has been taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Tarfon, Branches of palm-trees<sup>33</sup> [mean that the palm-branches must be] tied up.<sup>34</sup> and if they were separated, one must tie them up.<sup>35</sup> But does he not then demand that it be goodly? Have we not in fact learnt, ‘The Lulab<sup>36</sup> is bound only with its own species; so R. Judah’,<sup>37</sup> the reason presumably being that it must be goodly? — No! Since Raba said [that it may be bound] even with

the bast or the root of the palm.<sup>37</sup> What then is the reason of R. Judah? —

Because he is of the opinion that the [components] of the Lulab must be bound together and if one employs another species,<sup>38</sup> the number of species becomes five.<sup>39</sup> But does R. Judah demand that the Ethrog be goodly? Has it not in fact been taught, As to the Four Species of the Lulab, just as one may not diminish from them, so one may not add to them. If he cannot find an Ethrog, he may neither bring a quince nor a pomegranate, nor any other thing. Dried up [Ethrogs] are valid, withered ones are invalid. R. Judah says, Even withered ones [are valid]. And R. Judah, furthermore said, It happened

- (1) V. supra n. 2.
- (2) Since it is used in the mentioned wreath.
- (3) Whereby one robs the public of access to it.
- (4) Between R. Eliezer and the Sages.
- (5) The robber.
- (6) The rightful owner of the land upon which the Sukkah is erected. Lit., ‘he seizes his fellow and ejects him’. (Whatever is attached to the ground is subject to the laws of title that apply to landed property).
- (7) In ruling the Sukkahs mentioned invalid.
- (8) And, therefore, invalid.
- (9) And the land as well as the Sukkah are, therefore, the property of the rightful owner (cf. supra p. 135, n. 13).
- (10) And R. Eliezer excludes both stolen and borrowed Sukkahs by his exposition of ‘to thee’ supra.
- (11) The Sages.
- (12) And, therefore, valid.
- (13) Even R. Eliezer.
- (14) But the wood itself passes into the possession of the robber who has acquired it by change of function and name, and the Sukkah being neither robbed nor borrowed, is consequently valid.
- (15) That the dispute depends on the questions whether land may be legally acquired by robbery and whether a borrowed Sukkah is valid.
- (16) Both appearing in juxtaposition.
- (17) I.e., it does not belong to the man who put up a Sukkah on it since it obviously belongs to the public.
- (18) And consequently must refer to the case where he forcibly ejected the owner.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(19) From whom the servants of the Exilarch had robbed the wood wherewith his Sukkah was covered.

(20) Demanding the return of her wood.

(21) Rashi suggests that this refers to Abraham the father of all Jews, who had three hundred and eighteen servants (Gen. XIV, 14).

(22) Sc. there is no need to break up the structure in order to return to her the actual wood (cf. Git. 55a).

(23) And if it were to be removed, the Sukkah would collapse.

(24) That the owner be given the value of it only.

(25) The locus classicus of this law, referring to a house; the Sukkah, though a frail structure, having been given in this respect the status of a permanent structure during the festival days.

(26) The law of the joist.

(27) Concerning which it has just been ruled that its value only is to be paid to the owner.

(28) And the robbed man can, therefore, easily buy some with the money.

(29) Cf. prev. n. mut. mut.

(30) That the joist itself need not be returned.

(31) So that it becomes a permanent fixture.

(32) As is explicitly stated in Lev. XXIII, 40.

(33) Lev. XXIII, 40; 'branches' כַּפְּתוֹת.

(34) כַּפְּתוֹת the root כָּפַת in Biblical, Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew means 'to bind'.

(35) Infra 32a.

(36) Lit., 'palm-branch'. Where Lulab is used it refers to all three species tied together. V. infra.

(37) Infra 36a.

(38) For the binding.

(39) Instead of the four prescribed in Lev. XXIII, 40; and it is forbidden to add to any legally prescribed number.

## Sukkah 31b

that urban dwellers<sup>1</sup> used to bequeath their Lulabs to their grandchildren. They<sup>2</sup> said to him, Is that a proof? A case of emergency does not constitute a proof.<sup>3</sup> At all events it is taught that R. Judah says that even withered ones are valid, and this refers, does it not, to the Ethrog?<sup>4</sup> — No! It refers to the palm-branch.

The Master has said, 'Just as one may not diminish from them, so one may not add to them'. But is not this obvious? — I would have said that since R. Judah said that the Lulabs<sup>5</sup> must be bound, if one bring another species,<sup>6</sup> each is regarded as separate,<sup>7</sup> therefore he informs us [that it is not so].<sup>8</sup>

The Master has said, 'If he cannot find an Ethrog, he may bring neither a pomegranate nor a quince, nor any other thing'. But is not this obvious? — I would have said that he may bring it in order that the law of Ethrog might not be forgotten, therefore he informs us [that it is forbidden lest] at times the result be disastrous, since one might confound [the one fruit with the other].<sup>9</sup>

Come and hear: An old Ethrog is invalid, but R. Judah declares it valid. [Is not this a] refutation of Raba? — It is a refutation. But does not [R. Judah] demand that it<sup>10</sup> be goodly? Have we not in fact learnt: If it<sup>10</sup> is green as a leek, R. Meir declares it valid and R. Judah invalid?<sup>11</sup> Is it<sup>12</sup> not because it<sup>10</sup> must be goodly? No! Because the fruit is not yet ripe.

Come and hear: The minimum size of an Ethrog is, R. Meir says, the size of a nut; R. Judah says that of an egg.<sup>11</sup> Is it<sup>12</sup> not because it<sup>10</sup> must be goodly? — No! Because the fruit is not ripe.

Come and hear: Its<sup>10</sup> maximum size is such that one should be able to hold two in one hand; so R. Judah. R. Jose says, Even if one can hold one Ethrog in both hands.<sup>11</sup> Now what is the reason?<sup>13</sup> Is it not because he requires it to be goodly? — No! Because Rabbah<sup>14</sup> said, The Lulab [must be held] in the right hand and the Ethrog in the left,<sup>15</sup> and since sometimes he might put them in the wrong hands, when he changes over [the Ethrog might fall] and become invalid.<sup>16</sup> But, according to R. Judah is it not written in Scripture 'goodly'?<sup>17</sup> — This means 'that which remains upon the tree from year to year'.<sup>18</sup>

ONE THAT CAME FROM AN ASHERAH OR FROM A CONDEMNED CITY. Is then [the palm-branch that came from] an Asherah invalid? Did not Raba in fact say, One should not take a palm-branch of

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

idolatry, but if he did nevertheless take it, it is valid?<sup>19</sup> — Here we are dealing with an Asherah [dating from the time of] Moses, whose [minimum] size<sup>20</sup> [is regarded as] crushed.<sup>21</sup> A deduction from the wording also proves this, since it<sup>22</sup> is compared with a condemned city.<sup>23</sup> This is conclusive.

**IF ITS TOP WAS BROKEN OFF.** R. Huna said, 'BROKEN OFF' only was taught, but if it is only split, it is valid. Is it then valid if it is split? Has it not been taught, A palm-branch which is bent,

- (1) Who could not obtain fresh ones.
- (2) The Rabbis who disagreed with him.
- (3) Tosef. Suk. II.
- (4) How then could it be maintained that R. Judah insists on the Ethrog being goodly?
- (5) Lit., 'palm-branch'. Where Lulab is used it refers to all three species tied together. V. infra.
- (6) Without binding it with the others.
- (7) I.e., the extra species is regarded as something apart from the four and hence permissible.
- (8) Even a species that is unbound may not be added.
- (9) And thus use a quince or a pomegranate even where an Ethrog is obtainable.
- (10) The Ethrog.
- (11) Infra 34a.
- (12) R. Judah's reason.
- (13) For R. Judah's ruling.
- (14) Var. lec. 'Raba' (Bah).
- (15) Infra 37b.
- (16) If the Ethrog is too large for him to grasp in his hand together with his Lulab, as he is changing over, he will drop it. Hence the ruling that 'one should be able to hold two in one hand', one of these two representing the space the Lulab would occupy during the change.
- (17) Specially in connection with the Ethrog, Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (18) The word קדר 'goodly' is translated by R. Judah homiletically as קדר 'which dwells'. V. infra 35a.
- (19) Hul. 89a.
- (20) V. Mishnah supra 29b.
- (21) A thing that is condemned to be burnt is regarded as burnt, and since it must be burnt (cf. Deut. XII, 3) it is regarded as non-existent.
- (22) The Asherah.
- (23) Which must too be burnt and, therefore, regarded as non-existent.

## Sukkah 32a

thorny, split or curved like a sickle is invalid. If it<sup>1</sup> has become hardened,<sup>2</sup> it is invalid. If it only appears as though it is hardened,<sup>3</sup> it is valid?<sup>4</sup> —

R. Papa answered, It<sup>5</sup> refers to where it<sup>6</sup> is like a prong.<sup>7</sup> 'If it is curved like a sickle', Raba said, refers only to its front, but towards its back, it is its nature [to be curved]. R. Nahman said, At the sides<sup>8</sup> is the same as at the front, and some say, The same as at its back. Raba further said, A palm-branch of which all the foliage grows on one side is a blemished plant and is invalid.

**IF ITS LEAVES WERE BROKEN OFF, etc.** R. Papa said. 'DETACHED' means like a broom,<sup>9</sup> 'SPREAD APART' means that they were parted from one another.<sup>10</sup> R. Papa asked, How if the central leaf<sup>11</sup> is split?<sup>12</sup> —

Come and hear what R. Johanan<sup>13</sup> said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi: If the central leaf is removed, it<sup>6</sup> is invalid. No doubt if it is split the same law would apply? No, if it is removed the law is different, since it is entirely lacking. Another version is that R. Johanan said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi:<sup>13</sup> If the central leaf is split, it is as though it is removed, and [the Lulab] is invalid.

**R. JUDAH SAYS.** It has been taught: R. Judah said in the name of R. Tarfon, 'Branches of palm-trees', [means that palm-branches must be] tied up, and if they were separated, one must tie them up.<sup>14</sup> Rabina said to R. Ashi, How do we know that 'Branches of palm-trees' refers to the [green sprouts of the] palm-branches? Perhaps it means [branches of] the hardened palm?<sup>15</sup> — It must be [a branch the leaves of which can be] bound up, and this one<sup>16</sup> cannot.<sup>17</sup> But<sup>18</sup> perhaps it means the stalk [itself]?<sup>19</sup> — [Since the word]

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

'bound' is used, it must refer to something which can be separated, but this is permanently bound. But perhaps it means the inflorescence of palms?<sup>20</sup> —

Abaye answered, It is written, Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.<sup>21</sup> Raba Tosfa'ah said to Rabina, But perhaps it means two branches of palms? — The word is written kappath.<sup>22</sup> Then perhaps it means one? — That would be called kaf.<sup>23</sup>

**THE THORN-PALMS OF THE IRON MOUNTAIN ARE VALID.** Abaye said, They taught it only where the top of one [leaf] reaches the junction of the next, but if the top of the one does not reach the junction of the next,<sup>24</sup> it<sup>25</sup> is invalid. So it has also been taught: The thorn-palms of the iron mountain are invalid. But have we not learnt that they are valid? It may be deduced, therefore, [that the ruling is] in agreement with Abaye. This is conclusive.

- (1) The palm-branch.
- (2) Wooden.
- (3) Sc. it began to harden but the process was not yet complete.
- (4) Now since this Baraitha distinctly ruled a split Lulab to be invalid how could R. Huna uphold it to be valid?
- (5) The Baraitha.
- (6) The Lulab.
- (7) If it is naturally split to this extent even R. Huna agrees that it is invalid.
- (8) Sc. if the Lulab is bent sideways.
- (9) Leaves detached from the central rib and subsequently bound together.
- (10) But joined to the rib at their roots.
- (11) Lit., 'the twins', the central leaf being a junction of two.
- (12) The split reaching as low as the top of the lower leaves.
- (13) In the parallel passage in B.K. 96a the reading is R. Mathon.
- (14) Supra 31a q.v. notes.
- (15) I.e., a palm which is some years old, whose branches have become hardened like other tree branches, and there must be one central branch and one protruding from each side.
- (16) The hardened branch.
- (17) Since the branches are too hard.

(18) Since it is insisted that the branch must be 'bound'.

(19) From which no leaves branch out at all.

(20) A spike covered with flowers, and enveloped by one or more spathes. Being only one or two years old its leaves can still be bent and bound to the central parts.

(21) Prov. III, 17; i.e., it is unpleasant to hold this prickly spike and, therefore, the Torah could not have referred to it.

(22) Implying the singular. The word כפה is written defectively, which can be read as כפה (cf. supra 31a).

(23) A branch; not Kappath which implies something that has to be bound, v. supra.

(24) These thorn-palms are very sparsely covered with leaves, so that the top of the lower leaf may not reach as far as the beginning of the one above it.

(25) The branch.

## Sukkah 32b

Some put it<sup>1</sup> in the form of mutual contradiction: We have learnt: **THE THORN-PALMS OF THE IRON MOUNTAIN ARE VALID.** But has it not been taught that they are invalid? Abaye answered, There is no difficulty: The one<sup>2</sup> refers to where the top of the one leaf reaches the junction of the next; the other<sup>3</sup> to where the top of the one does not reach the junction of the other. R. Marion said in the name of R. Joshua b. Levi, while others say that Rabbah b. Mari taught in the name of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, There are two palms in the valley of Hinnom,<sup>4</sup> between which there ascends smoke, and it is in that connection that we have learnt, **THE THORN-PALMS OF THE IRON MOUNTAIN ARE VALID,** and it is the entrance to Gehenna.

**A PALM-BRANCH WHICH IS THREE HANDBREADTHS IN LENGTH.** Rab Judah said in the name of Samuel, The [minimum] length of the myrtle and the willow is three [handbreadths], and that of the palm-branch four, so that the palm-branch should extend one handbreadth beyond the myrtle. And R. Parnak said in the name of R. Johanan, The stems<sup>5</sup> of the palm-branch should extend a handbreadth



# SUCAH – 29b-56b

beyond the myrtle. Have we not learnt, A PALM-BRANCH WHICH IS THREE HANDBREADTHS IN LENGTH, LONG ENOUGH TO WAVE, IS VALID?<sup>6</sup> — Read AND LONG ENOUGH TO WAVE;<sup>7</sup> and each one<sup>8</sup> explains it according to his own view.<sup>9</sup>

Come and hear: [We have learnt.] The [minimum] length of the myrtle and the willow is three [handbreadths], and that of the palm-branch four. Surely [this means, does it not,] inclusive of the leaves?<sup>10</sup> — No, exclusive of the leaves. [To turn to] the main text: The [minimum] length of the myrtle and the willow is three [handbreadths], and that of the palm-branch four. R. Tarfon says, A cubit<sup>11</sup> consisting of five handbreadths.<sup>12</sup> Raba said, May R. Tarfon's Master forgive him [for this absurd statement]! We cannot find a valid myrtle three [handbreadths] long, would one of five handbreadths be required?<sup>13</sup>

When R. Dimi came<sup>14</sup> he explained. [R. Tarfon meant thus]: Make a cubit which has [normally] six handbreadths, into five.<sup>15</sup> Deduct from these the three for the myrtle and the remainder is for the palm-branch. How much then<sup>16</sup> is it?<sup>17</sup> Three and three fifths?<sup>18</sup> Do not then two statements of Samuel contradict one another, for here Rab Judah says in the name of Samuel, The [minimum] length of the myrtle and the willow is three [normal handbreadths], and elsewhere R. Huna said in the name of Samuel that the Halachah is as R. Tarfon?<sup>19</sup> —

[Samuel] was not precise.<sup>20</sup> But do we not say that one is not precise only when [this results in] a restriction [of the law] but not when [it results in] a relaxation of it?<sup>21</sup> When Rabin came,<sup>22</sup> he explained: [R. Tarfon meant thus]: Make a cubit of five normal handbreadths into one of six handbreadths. Deduct of these three for the myrtle, and the remainder is for the palm-

branch. But how much<sup>16</sup> is it?<sup>23</sup> Two and a half.<sup>24</sup> Is there not 'then a discrepancy between [the two statements of] Samuel?<sup>25</sup> — [The answer is that] he was not precise, and in this case his lack of precision<sup>26</sup> results in a restriction [of the law], since R. Huna said in the name of Samuel that the Halachah is as R. Tarfon.<sup>27</sup>

*MISHNAH.* A STOLEN OR WITHERED MYRTLE IS NOT VALID, ONE OF AN ASHERAH OR OF A CONDEMNED CITY IS INVALID. IF ITS TIP WAS BROKEN OFF, OR ITS LEAVES WERE SEVERED, OR IF ITS BERRIES WERE MORE NUMEROUS THAN ITS LEAVES, IT IS INVALID, BUT IF HE DIMINISHED THEIR NUMBER IT IS VALID. ONE MAY NOT, HOWEVER, DIMINISH THEM ON THE FESTIVAL.

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis taught, 'Boughs of a thick tree'<sup>28</sup> [means] [that kind of tree] whose branches completely cover its trunk. Now what [tree] is this? Obviously you must say that it is the myrtle. But perhaps it is the olive?<sup>29</sup> — It must be wreathed,<sup>30</sup> which [the olive] is not. But perhaps it is the plane tree?<sup>31</sup> — It is required that the branches shall cover its trunk, which is not the case [with the plane tree]. But perhaps it is the oleander?<sup>32</sup> Abaye said, 'Its<sup>33</sup> ways<sup>34</sup> are the ways of pleasantness',<sup>35</sup> and [with the oleander] this is not the case.<sup>36</sup> Raba expressed [the same idea] from the following verse, Therefore love ye truth and peace.<sup>37</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, [That plant whose leaves are] shaped like a plait, and resemble a chain, is the myrtle. R. Eliezer b. Jacob said 'The boughs of a thick tree'<sup>28</sup> [means] a tree the taste of whose wood and whose fruit is similar: Say, then, it is the myrtle.

A Tanna taught, A tree which is 'aboth<sup>38</sup> is valid, and which is not 'Aboth is not valid. What constitutes 'Aboth? — Rab Judah said, When three leaves grow out of one nest.<sup>39</sup> R. Kahana said, Even [if they only

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

grow in] twos and ones.<sup>40</sup> R. Aha the son of Raba sought to obtain<sup>41</sup> one [whose leaves grew] in twos and ones, since R. Kahana said [that such are valid]. Mar b. Amemar said to R. Ashi, 'My father used to call that<sup>42</sup> the wild myrtle'.

Our Rabbis taught, If the larger part of its<sup>43</sup> leaves fell off<sup>44</sup> and the lesser part remained, it is valid, provided that its wreath-work<sup>45</sup> remains. But is not this self-contradictory? You said that if the larger part of its leaves fell off<sup>44</sup> it is valid and then it is stated, 'provided that its wreath-work remains'. But since two [of the three leaves] have fallen off, how is it possible to have a wreath-work? —

Abaye said, It is possible

- (1) Our Mishnah as well as the Baraitha cited.
- (2) Our Mishnah.
- (3) The Baraitha.
- (4) A valley near Jerusalem. v. Jer. XIX, 2.
- (5) Not merely the leaves.
- (6) How then could Samuel and R. Johanan maintain that the length must be four handbreadths?
- (7) Sc. the part which extends beyond the myrtle and willow, which is, therefore, not bound and can be waved.
- (8) Samuel and R. Johanan.
- (9) According to Samuel a handbreadth including the leaves, according to R. Johanan one excluding the leaves.
- (10) An objection against R. Johanan.
- (11) [מאמא. So MS.M. Cur. edd.: מאמא (to be measured by) a cubit, etc.].
- (12) This is now assumed to mean that the myrtle and the willow must each be one such cubit long.
- (13) Obviously not.
- (14) From Palestine to Babylon.
- (15) A normal handbreadth is one-sixth of a cubit. R. Tarfon made its measurement for the purpose of the Lulab one fifth instead of one sixth. [I.e., R. Dimi reported that R. Tarfon said מאמא and not מאמא, cf. p. 142, n. 8.]
- (16) In normal handbreadths.
- (17) The three handbreadths each of which is equal to a fifth of the six normal handbreadths.
- (18) Since the three handbreadths of the myrtle are equivalent to  $3 \times 1 \frac{1}{5} = 3 \frac{3}{5}$  normal handbreadths.
- (19) Who prescribes  $3 \frac{3}{5}$  normal handbreadths.

- (20) By three he really meant  $3 \frac{3}{5}$ .
- (21) Three instead of  $3 \frac{3}{5}$ .
- (22) From Palestine to Babylon.
- (23) The three handbreadths each of which equals  $\frac{5}{6}$  of a normal one.
- (24) The normal cubit of six handbreadths being divided into five, each handbreadth is  $\frac{5}{6}$  of a normal handbreadth. The three handbreadths of the myrtle, therefore, equal  $(3 \times \frac{5}{6} = \frac{15}{6} =) 2 \frac{1}{2}$  normal handbreadths, leaving  $2 \frac{1}{2}$  for the extending portion of the palm-branch.
- (25) Three, against two and a half normal handbreadths.
- (26) The number three.
- (27) That only a length of two and half normal handbreadths is enough.
- (28) Lev. XXIII, 40; E.V., 'of thick trees'.
- (29) Whose branches also cover its trunk.
- (30) 'Aboth (E.V., 'thick'), i.e., the leaves must grow in a sort of wreath-like formation.
- (31) Whose leaves also grow in wreath-like formation.
- (32) A bitter plant with stinging leaves which possesses both required characteristics.
- (33) The Torah's.
- (34) Sc. the performance of its commandments.
- (35) Prov. III, 17.
- (36) Since it is both bitter and stinging.
- (37) Zech. VIII, 19. There is in it neither 'peace' since it stings, nor 'love' since it is bitter and poisonous.
- (38) The leaves of which grow in wreath-like formation, v. supra n. 3.
- (39) Where the leaf emerges from the stem.
- (40) Two leaves coming out of one nest, and one from the lower one ascends and touches them.
- (41) For his Lulab.
- (42) One whose leaves grow in twos and ones.
- (43) The myrtle's.
- (44) Sc. of each group of three leaves two fell off.
- (45) I.e., that three leaves are still coming out from each nest of the stem. The contradiction is discussed anon.

## Sukkah 33a

with the Egyptian<sup>1</sup> myrtle which has seven [leaves] in each nest, and [therefore] when four fall off, there are still three left. Abaye said, [From this] we can deduce that the Egyptian myrtle is valid for the Hoshanna<sup>2</sup> But is not this obvious? — I might have said that since it has a distinctive name, it cannot be considered valid, therefore he informs us [that it is valid]. But perhaps it is indeed so?<sup>3</sup> — The Divine Law says, 'boughs of a thick tree'<sup>4</sup> i.e., of any kind.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Our Rabbis taught, If the larger part of its leaves were withered, and only three twigs with green leaves<sup>5</sup> remained, it is valid. And R. Hisda added, [Provided] that they<sup>6</sup> are at the top of each [twig].<sup>7</sup>

**IF ITS TIP WAS BROKEN OFF.** ‘Ulla bar Hinena taught, If its tip was broken off, and a berry grew on it,<sup>8</sup> it is valid. R. Jeremiah asked, If the tip was broken off before the Festival, and the berry grew on it on the Festival,<sup>9</sup> what [is the law]? Do we apply the law of disability to [all] commandments or not?<sup>10</sup> — Can he not decide this point from that which we have learnt: If he covered it and it became uncovered, he need not cover it again; if the wind covered it, he must cover it again.<sup>11</sup> And Rabbah b. Bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan, They taught this<sup>12</sup> only where it subsequently became uncovered, but if it did not subsequently become uncovered, he is free from [the duty of] covering it. And when we asked concerning this, ‘Even if it subsequently became uncovered, why must he cover it? Once it<sup>13</sup> has suffered<sup>14</sup> the disability<sup>15</sup> is it not permanently disabled?’<sup>16</sup> R. Papa said, This implies that the law of disability does not apply to [all] commandments? —

The question [of R. Jeremiah] is concerning that very statement of R. Papa: Is he<sup>17</sup> certain that the law of disability does not apply to [all] commandments, irrespective of whether it is in the direction of stringency<sup>18</sup> or leniency,<sup>19</sup> or perhaps he<sup>17</sup> is doubtful, and therefore we apply it in the direction of stringency,<sup>18</sup> but not in the direction of leniency?<sup>19</sup> It remains unanswered.<sup>20</sup> Can we say that these<sup>21</sup> are according to the dispute of Tannas? [For we have learnt], If he transgressed and picked them<sup>22</sup> off,<sup>23</sup> it is invalid. These are the words of R. Eleazar b. Zadok,<sup>24</sup> while the Sages declare it valid.<sup>25</sup>

Now they<sup>26</sup> were of the opinion that according to all<sup>27</sup> the Lulab does not need binding, and that, even if some reason could be found for ruling that it does need binding, we do not deduce [the laws of] Lulab from those of Sukkah of which it is written, ‘Thou shalt make’ [which implies] but not from that which is already made.<sup>28</sup> Surely then they disagree on the following principle viz., that he who declares it invalid is of the opinion that we apply the law of disability to [all] commandments,<sup>29</sup> while he who declares it to be valid is of the opinion that we do not apply the law of disability<sup>30</sup> to [all] commandments?<sup>31</sup> —

No! All agree that we do not apply the law of disability to [all] commandments, but they disagree here in whether we deduce [the laws of] Lulab from [those of] Sukkah. One Master<sup>32</sup> is of the opinion that we do so deduce them,<sup>33</sup> while the other Master<sup>34</sup> is of the opinion that we do not make such a deduction. And if you wish you may say that if it were held that the Lulab needs binding all would have agreed that we deduce [the laws of] Lulab from [those of] Sukkah;<sup>33</sup> but they disagree here on whether the Lulab needs binding, as is the case in the dispute of these Tannas of whom it has been taught: A Lulab, whether [the other prescribed species were] bound with it or not, is valid. R. Judah says, If it is bound [with the others] it is valid; if it is unbound, it is invalid.<sup>35</sup> What is the reason of R. Judah? —

He deduces it from the word ‘take’ [which occurs here and with] the bundle of hyssop. It is written here, And ye shall take on the first day,<sup>36</sup> and there it is written And ye shall take a bundle of hyssop.<sup>37</sup> Just as there [it must be] a bundle, so here also [it must be] a bundle. And the Rabbis?<sup>38</sup> —

They make no deduction from the mention of the word ‘take’ in the two passages. Who is it that learned that which our Rabbis have taught: It is a pious deed to bind the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Lulab, but [even] if he did not bind it, it is valid? Now who is it? If R. Judah be suggested, why is it valid if he did not bind it? If the Rabbis are suggested, what pious deed does he perform?<sup>39</sup> — It is in fact the Rabbis, and the pious deed spoken of is due to ‘This is my God and I will glorify Him’.<sup>40</sup>

**OR IF ITS BERRIES WERE MORE NUMEROUS THAN ITS LEAVES.** R. Hisda said, The following statement was made by our great Master,<sup>41</sup> and may the Omnipresent be his help! They taught it<sup>42</sup> only [if all the berries were] in one place, but if in two or three places, it<sup>43</sup> is valid. Said Raba,<sup>44</sup>

- (1) Or ‘hedge’, where it is free to grow unhampered (Rashi).
- (2) The festive wreath.
- (3) That it is not valid.
- (4) V. supra p. 144, n. 1.
- (5) Each twig having three leaves on it.
- (6) The leaves.
- (7) If they are not at the top, the myrtle cannot be regarded as ‘goodly’ and is, therefore, invalid.
- (8) A kind of berry which can grow even on a detached myrtle (Rashi).
- (9) While it was bound to the Lulab.
- (10) As it applies to sacrifices. Once a disability appears in a sacrifice after it is slain, even if the disability is removed, the sacrifice is still regarded as invalid. Similarly here the myrtle has become disabled for use before the Festival, and recovers its sound state on the Festival, and the question is whether or not the disability it once suffered renders it permanently invalid.
- (11) Hul. 87a. The Mishnah refers to the law of covering up the blood of a bird or beast. V. Lev. XVII, 13 and Mishnah Hul. VI.
- (12) That if the wind covered the blood it must be covered up again.
- (13) The blood.
- (14) When the wind had covered it.
- (15) I.e., there was no obligation then to cover it again.
- (16) Even after it had been uncovered. Why then has it been ruled that it must be covered again?
- (17) The Tanna of the Mishnah cited.
- (18) As in the case of the blood which must be covered again.
- (19) As in that of the broken myrtle where the growth of the berry would render it valid.
- (20) Teku, v. Glos.

- (21) The two views on the law of disability.
- (22) The berries whose number exceeded that of the leaves. V. supra 11b.
- (23) On the Festival when such picking is Rabbinically forbidden as Shebuth (v. Glos.).
- (24) The reading supra 11b is ‘R. Simeon b. Jehozadak’.
- (25) Supra 11b.
- (26) The Rabbis at the college who were discussing the question.
- (27) Sc. the Rabbis and R. Eleazar.
- (28) So that the disqualification of the Lulab cannot be due to the fact that when the myrtle became fit the festive wreath had already been made.
- (29) As the myrtle was once invalid it must always remain so.
- (30) Which is applicable to holy sacrifices.
- (31) Hence the validity of the myrtle after the number of its berries had been reduced on the festival.
- (32) R. Eleazar.
- (33) As a Sukkah that was not made for the festival is invalid so also is the festive wreath invalid if the validity of the myrtle was effected after the wreath had been made.
- (34) The Sages.
- (35) Supra 11b.
- (36) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (37) Ex. XII, 22.
- (38) How can they maintain their view in the face of this deduction?
- (39) Seeing that they require no binding.
- (40) Ex. XV, 2. For the whole passage and notes cf. supra 11b.
- (41) Rab.
- (42) The ruling just cited from our Mishnah.
- (43) The myrtle.
- (44) So Bah. Cur. edd. add ‘to him’.

## Sukkah 33b

[If the berries are in] two or three places it is regarded as speckled,<sup>1</sup> and [therefore] invalid. Rather if it<sup>2</sup> was at all stated, thus was it stated: **OR IF ITS BERRIES WERE MORE NUMEROUS THAN ITS LEAVES, IT IS INVALID.** R. Hisda said, The following statement was made by our great Master, and may the Omnipresent be his help! They taught this only if the berries were black,<sup>3</sup> but if they were green they are merely a species of myrtle and valid. R. Papa said, Red [berries] are like black,<sup>4</sup> since R. Hanina said, Black blood is [in

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

reality] red blood except that it deteriorated.<sup>5</sup>

**IF HE DIMINISHED THEIR NUMBER, IT IS VALID.** When did he diminish them? If you say, before he bound them,<sup>6</sup> is not this obvious? Consequently it must be said, after he bound them?<sup>7</sup> This then is a disability from the very outset.<sup>8</sup> Why then may it not be deduced therefrom that a disability from the outset<sup>8</sup> is no [permanent] disability?<sup>9</sup> — Indeed it refers to [a diminution that took place] after he bound them, but he<sup>10</sup> is of the opinion that the binding is merely a designation [for its purpose], and a mere designation is of no consequence.<sup>11</sup>

**THE DIMINUTION, HOWEVER, MAY NOT TAKE PLACE ON THE FESTIVAL.** But if he transgressed and did pluck them,<sup>12</sup> how is it? Is it valid? But then, when did it become black? If you will say that it became black from the previous day,<sup>13</sup> then it is a disability from the very outset.<sup>14</sup> Why then may it not be deduced therefrom that a disability from the very outset is no disability? Consequently it must be conceded, must it not, that it became black on the Festival. It is thus a case of being fit<sup>12</sup> and then disabled. May it then be deduced therefrom that if anything was fit<sup>12</sup> and then suffered a disability it may become fit again? — No! Indeed it refers to where it became black before the Festival; and that a disability from the very outset<sup>11</sup> is no disability you may well deduce therefrom; but that where it was fit<sup>12</sup> and then suffered a disability it becomes fit again you may not deduce therefrom.

Our Rabbis taught, The diminution<sup>15</sup> may not take place on the Festival. In the name of R. Eliezer son of R. Simeon they said that it may be diminished.<sup>16</sup> But is he not<sup>17</sup> improving an object<sup>18</sup> on the Festival?<sup>19</sup> —

R. Ashi said, This is a case where he plucked them<sup>20</sup> for food,<sup>21</sup> and R. Eliezer

son of R. Simeon maintains the same opinion as his father who said that a work which is done without intention is permitted. But do not both Abaye and Raba say that R. Simeon admits in the case of ‘cut off his head, but let him not die’<sup>22</sup> [that it is forbidden]?<sup>23</sup> — Here we are dealing with a case where he has another Hoshanna.<sup>24</sup> Our Rabbis taught, If the binding<sup>25</sup> became loosened on the Festival,<sup>26</sup> he may bind it as one binds vegetables.<sup>27</sup> But why [should this<sup>28</sup> be necessary]? Why should not one make a proper loop?<sup>29</sup> — [This statement is] according to R. Judah who says that a loop is to be considered a proper knot.<sup>30</sup> But if it is according to R. Judah, should not a proper binding be required?<sup>31</sup> The Tanna [of the Baraitha] agrees with R. Judah on one point<sup>32</sup> and disagrees with him on the other.<sup>33</sup>

**MISHNAH.** A STOLEN OR WITHERED WILLOW-BRANCH IS INVALID. ONE FROM AN ASHERAH OR FROM A CONDEMNED CITY IS INVALID. ONE WHOSE TIP WAS BROKEN OFF OR WHOSE LEAVES WERE SEVERED, OR A MOUNTAIN WILLOW<sup>34</sup> IS INVALID. ONE THAT WAS SHRIVELLED OR HAD LOST SOME OF ITS LEAVES, OR ONE GROWN IN A NATURALLY WATERED SOIL,<sup>35</sup> IS VALID.

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis taught, Willows of the brook<sup>36</sup> means those which grow by a brook. Another interpretation of ‘willows of the brook’ is one whose leaf is elongated as a brook.<sup>37</sup> Another Baraitha taught: ‘Willows of the brook’, [might mean] willows of the brook only. Whence do we know that those grown on naturally watered soil and mountain willows [are also valid]? Scripture expressly states, ‘willows<sup>38</sup> of the brook’, i.e., from any place.

(1) Since the leaves are green while the berries are black.

(2) R. Hisda's tradition just cited.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (3) In which case it is speckled (cf. supra n. 7) and invalid.
- (4) And, therefore, invalid.
- (5) With regard to the blood of menstruation (v. Nid. 28a).
- (6) So that when it was bound with the other species it was already valid.
- (7) So that at the time of binding it was invalid.
- (8) I.e., a disability that appeared before the Festival. Such a disability having appeared before the time for the fulfillment of the Festival is due does not invalidate permanently the object of ritual, which on recovering its normal status, becomes fit for use, v. infra.
- (9) A question that remained unanswered, v. infra.
- (10) The Tanna of our Mishnah.
- (11) Sc. the plants do not thereby assume the full character of a festive wreath. The disability, therefore, cannot be regarded as having occurred prior to the Festival.
- (12) On the Festival.
- (13) The Festival eve.
- (14) V. p. 148, n. 14.
- (15) Of the berries (cf. our Mishnah).
- (16) On the Festival.
- (17) By making an invalid plant valid.
- (18) Lit., 'a vessel'.
- (19) Which is forbidden.
- (20) The berries.
- (21) Not for the purpose of rendering the plant valid.
- (22) The symbolic representation of the fact that although one has not the intention of bringing about a certain result, it is nevertheless an inevitable consequence.
- (23) And the validity of the myrtle is the inevitable consequence of the plucking of the berries.
- (24) Being independent of the one with the berries the removal of the latter cannot be regarded as the improvement of an object.
- (25) Of the three species of the festive wreath.
- (26) When the tying of a knot is forbidden.
- (27) No knot is made and the loose end is inserted between the winding and the plants.
- (28) Mode of binding.
- (29) Which not being a knot is permitted on the Festival.
- (30) Shab. 113a.
- (31) As laid down by him supra 33a.
- (32) That a loop is regarded as a proper knot and is forbidden on the Festival.
- (33) That the Lulab must be properly bound.
- (34) **צפצפה** v. infra 34a.
- (35) Sc. land which does not need artificial irrigation.
- (36) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (37) And not rounded.

(38) In the plural.

## Sukkah 34a

Abba Saul<sup>1</sup> says, Willows [in the plural means] two, one for the Lulab and one for the Sanctuary.<sup>2</sup> And whence do the Rabbis deduce [the law of the willow] for the Sanctuary? — They had this as an accepted tradition; for R. Assi said in the name of R. Johanan, The laws of ten plants,<sup>4</sup> the willow-branch and the water libations<sup>5</sup> were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai.<sup>6</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, 'Willows of the brook'<sup>7</sup> means those that grow by the brook excluding the Zafzafah which is a willow that grows on the mountains. R. Zera said, Where is its Scriptural support?<sup>8</sup> — He placed it beside many waters, he set it as a Zafzafah.<sup>9</sup> Abaye said to him, Is it not possible that [the latter part] is merely an explanation:<sup>10</sup> 'He placed it beside many waters', and what was it? A Zafzafah? —

If so, what was the need for 'he set it'? R. Abbahu explained it:<sup>11</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said, I intended that Israel should be before Me as something placed beside many waters, that is, a willow, but they have made themselves as a Zafzafah of the mountains. Some teach this verse<sup>11</sup> in connection with the Baraitha:<sup>12</sup> 'He placed it beside many waters, he set it as a Zafzafah'.<sup>9</sup> To this R. Zera demurred, Is it not possible that [the latter part] is merely an explanation: 'He placed it beside many waters' and what was it? A Zafzafah? — If so, what could be the meaning of 'he set it'? R. Abbahu explained it:<sup>11</sup> The Holy One, blessed be He, said, I intended that Israel should be before Me as something placed beside many waters, that is, a willow, and they have made themselves as a Zafzafah of the mountains.

Our Rabbis taught, What is a willow and what a Zafzafah?—The willow has a red stem, an elongated leaf and a smooth edge; the Zafzafah has a white stem, a round leaf

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

and an edge serrated like a sickle. But has it not been taught, If it is like a sickle it is valid, if like a saw<sup>13</sup> it is invalid? —

Abaye said. That<sup>14</sup> was taught only with regard to the rounded willow.<sup>15</sup> Abaye said, Deduce therefrom that a rounded willow<sup>15</sup> is valid for the Hoshanna. But is not this obvious? — I would have said that since it has a distinctive name<sup>16</sup> it would be thereby invalid, therefore he informs us [that it is not so]. But perhaps it is indeed so?<sup>17</sup> — ‘Willows<sup>18</sup> of the brook’, says the Divine Law, implying from any place. R. Hisda said, Since the destruction of the temple the following three things have had their names interchanged. [What was formerly called] Hilpetha [is now called] ‘Arabta, and what was called ‘Arabta, is now called Hilpetha.<sup>19</sup> What does that legally matter? — With regard to the Lulab.<sup>20</sup> [What was before called] Shifora [is now called] hazozerah,<sup>21</sup> and what was Hazozerah is now Shifora. In what respect does this legally matter? —

In respect of the Shofar for the New Year. [What was formerly called] Pathora [is now called] Pathorta, and what was Pathorta is now Pathora.<sup>22</sup> In what respect does this matter legally? —

In respect of business transactions.<sup>23</sup> Abaye said, I also add [that what was formerly called] be Kase [is now called] Hublila,<sup>24</sup> and the former Hublila is now be Kase. In what respect does this legally matter? —

In respect of a needle found in the fleshy part of the second stomach.<sup>25</sup> Raba b. Joseph said, I also add that [what was formerly called] Babylon [is now called] Borsif<sup>26</sup> and the former Borsif is now Babylon. In what legal respect

(3) Who expound the plural ‘willows’ as referring to the validity of mountain willows and those that grow on naturally watered soil.

(4) That if there is a minimum of ten saplings to a Se'ah, the whole area may be plowed until the New Year of the Sabbatical year, since the digging is for the sake of the trees; not of the ground, v. Sheb. I, 6.

(5) V. infra 48a.

(6) V. supra.

(7) Lev. XXIII, 40.

(8) That the mountain willow is inferior to the ordinary one.

(9) Ezek. XVII, 5. The assumption is that the second part of the verse ‘he set it as a Zafzafah’ is in contrast to the former part, as R. Abbahu infra explains.

(10) Of the first part.

(11) The text just cited.

(12) I.e., the author of the Baraita and not R. Zera cited it. According to this version Abaye's objection is attributed to R. Zera.

(13) A sickle-like edge has all the teeth pointing in a slanting direction towards the handle; a saw-like edge has upright teeth (Rashi).

(14) ‘Like a sickle it is valid’.

(15) One with rounded leaves.

(16) ‘Rounded’ willow. V. supra p. 145.

(17) I.e., invalid.

(18) The plural form.

(19) Kinds of willow. The Hilpetha is identical with the Zafzafah and is invalid, the ‘Arabta is the valid willow.

(20) What is now called ‘Arabta is invalid, and vice versa.

(21) The Shifora or Shofar is the ram's horn which is valid for sounding on the New Year, the Hazozerah is a silver trumpet.

(22) The Pathora is a large table, usually of a money-changer, the Pathorta a small one.

(23) The seller must supply the article named in the contract in accordance with the current usage.

(24) Or Hablila. The Hablila is the first stomach of ruminants, the be Kase (or Beth ha-kosoth) the second stomach.

(25) If a needle is found in the first stomach, provided it does not perforate it, the animal remains ritually fit. If it is found in the second stomach the animal is ritually unfit (v. Hul. 50b).

(26) Borsippa, a town adjoining the old city of Babylon. v. Obermeyer. p. 314ff.

(1) Objecting to the deduction just made.

(2) V. infra 45a. In the Sanctuary they walked round the altar seven times with willows.

## Sukkah 34b

does this matter? — In respect of bills of divorcement?<sup>1</sup>

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

**MISHNAH.** R. ISHMAEL SAYS, [ONE MUST HAVE]<sup>2</sup> THREE MYRTLE-BRANCHES, TWO WILLOW-BRANCHES, ONE PALM-BRANCH AND ONE ETHROG. EVEN IF TWO [OF THE MYRTLE-BRANCHES] HAVE THEIR TIPS BROKEN OFF AND [ONLY] ONE IS WHOLE [THE WREATH IS VALID]. R. TARFON SAYS, EVEN IF ALL THREE HAVE THEIR TIPS BROKEN OFF. R. AKIBA SAID, JUST AS [IT IS NEEDED TO HAVE BUT] ONE PALM-BRANCH AND ONE ETHROG, SO [IT IS NEEDED TO HAVE BUT] ONE MYRTLE-BRANCH AND ONE WILLOW-BRANCH.

**GEMARA.** It has been taught, R. Ishmael said, ‘The fruit of a goodly tree’<sup>3</sup> implies one; ‘Branches of palm-trees’<sup>3</sup> implies one;<sup>4</sup> ‘boughs of thick trees’<sup>3</sup> implies three;<sup>5</sup> ‘willows of the brook’<sup>3</sup> implies two, and even if two [of the myrtle-branches] have their tips broken off, and only one is whole [the wreath is valid]. R. Tarfon said, [There must be] three,<sup>6</sup> [and they are valid] even if all have their tips broken off. R. Akiba said. Just as [it is necessary to have but] one palm-branch and one Ethrog, so [it is necessary to have but] one myrtle-branch and one willow-branch. R. Eliezer said to him,<sup>7</sup> If one should say that the Ethrog should be bound with them<sup>8</sup> in one bundle you can answer, Is it then written, ‘The fruit of a goodly tree and branches of palm-trees’? It says only, ‘The fruit of a goodly tree, branches of palm-trees’.<sup>9</sup> And whence do we know that they are a hindrance to one another?<sup>10</sup> Scripture teaches, ‘And ye shall take’,<sup>11</sup> [implying] that the taking must be complete.<sup>12</sup> As to R. Ishmael,<sup>13</sup> whichever view he takes [he is inconsistent]. For if he demands that the myrtle-branches] be whole, why should he not demand<sup>14</sup> that they all be whole, and if he does not demand it, why should even one [have to be whole]? —

Said Bira'ah in the name of R. Ammi, R. Ishmael recanted from this view.<sup>15</sup> Rab

Judah said in the name of Samuel, The Halachah is in agreement with R. Tarfon.<sup>16</sup> And Samuel is consistent; for in his view [expressed elsewhere] Samuel said to those who sold myrtle. ‘Sell at the normal price, for if not, I will expound to you as R. Tarfon’.<sup>17</sup> What is his reason?<sup>18</sup> If you will say that he wished to take a lenient view, why did he not expound to them as R. Akiba<sup>19</sup> who is still more lenient? — Three with broken tips are common, one with an unbroken tip is uncommon.<sup>20</sup>

**MISHNAH.** AN ETHROG WHICH IS STOLEN OR WITHERED IS INVALID. ONE FROM AN ASHERAH OR A CONDEMNED CITY IS INVALID. IF IT WAS OF ‘ORLAH<sup>21</sup> OR OF UNCLEAN TERUMAH<sup>22</sup> IT IS INVALID. IF IT WAS OF CLEAN TERUMAH HE SHOULD NOT TAKE IT,<sup>23</sup> BUT IF HE DID TAKE IT, IT IS VALID. IF IT WAS DEMAI,<sup>24</sup> BETH SHAMMAI DECLARE IT INVALID, AND BETH HILLEL DECLARE IT VALID. IF IT WAS OF SECOND TITHE, IT SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN<sup>23</sup> [EVEN] IN JERUSALEM, BUT IF HE TOOK IT, IT IS VALID. IF THE LARGER PART OF IT IS COVERED WITH SCARS, OR IF ITS NIPPLE IS REMOVED, IF IT IS PEELED, SPLIT, PERFORATED, SO THAT ANY PART IS MISSING, IT IS INVALID. IF ITS LESSER PART ONLY IS COVERED WITH SCARS, IF ITS STALK WAS MISSING, OR IF IT IS PERFORATED BUT NAUGHT OF IT IS MISSING, IT IS VALID. AN ETHIOPIAN<sup>25</sup> ETHROG IS INVALID. IF IT IS GREEN AS A LEEK, R. MEIR DECLARES IT VALID AND R. JUDAH DECLARES IT INVALID. THE MINIMUM SIZE OF AN ETHROG, R. MEIR SAYS, IS THAT OF A NUT. R. JUDAH SAYS THAT OF AN EGG. THE MAXIMUM [SIZE] IS SUCH THAT TWO CAN BE HELD IN ONE HAND. THESE ARE THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. R. JOSE SAID, EVEN ONE [THAT HE CAN HOLD ONLY] IN BOTH HIS HANDS.

(1) A bill of divorcement executed in the original Borsif and carried to another place is invalid unless the bearer made the declaration; ‘In my presence it was written and in my presence it



# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

was signed', while one brought from Babylon required no such declaration (cf. Git. 2a, 6a, and Sanh. 109a). For further notes on this passage v. Shab., Sonc. ed., fol. 36a.

- (2) For the festive wreath (cf. Lev. XXIII, 40).
- (3) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (4) Since the word is written in singular form. V. supra.
- (5) Corresponding to the three words in the original: 'Anaf, 'Ez and 'Aboth.
- (6) Myrtle-branches.
- (7) [Var. lec. rightly omit 'to him'].
- (8) The other three species.
- (9) The absence of the waw conjunctive in this case and its presence in the case of the myrtles and willows that follow indicates that while the last three must be tied together the first need not.
- (10) I.e., if one of the four species is missing it invalidates all.
- (11) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (12) The four species together.
- (13) Who requires only one myrtle-branch to be whole while the other two may have their tips broken off.
- (14) Since Scripture draws no distinction between the two and the one.
- (15) Sc. he now holds that one myrtle-branch is enough, but it must be whole.
- (16) That myrtle-branches whose tips are broken off are valid.
- (17) The people preferred whole, unbroken myrtles and to prevent exploitation by the vendors, Samuel threatened to expound that even broken ones are valid.
- (18) That Samuel threatened to rule as R. Tarfon.
- (19) Who requires only one myrtle-branch.
- (20) The threat to adopt R. Tarfon's ruling had, therefore, a greater effect.
- (21) The fruit of a tree during the first three years of its growth. V. Lev. XIX, 23.
- (22) V. Glos.
- (23) For the festive wreath.
- (24) Produce about which it is doubtful whether it has been tithed; lit., 'mixed'.
- (25) I.e., 'dark colored', 'black'.

## Sukkah 35a

**GEMARA.** Our Rabbis have taught, 'The fruit of a goodly tree'<sup>1</sup> implies<sup>2</sup> a tree the taste of whose 'fruit' and 'wood' is the same. Say then that it is the Ethrog. Might it not be said to be pepper, as it has been taught. 'R. Meir used to say, From the implication of the text, And ye have planted

all manner of trees,<sup>3</sup> do I not know that the reference is to a tree for food?<sup>4</sup> What then does Scripture teach by the [next phrase] "for food"? [That<sup>5</sup> the reference is to] a tree the taste of whose fruit and wood is the same. Say then that it is pepper. This is to teach you that the pepper tree<sup>6</sup> is subject to the law of 'Orlah and that the Land of Israel lacks nothing, as it is said, Thou shalt not lack anything in it'<sup>7</sup> —

There<sup>8</sup> [pepper is excluded] since it is impossible [to use it].<sup>9</sup> For how shall he proceed? If he take one [pepper seed],<sup>9</sup> it is unrecognizable;<sup>10</sup> if he takes two or three, the Divine Law surely said, one 'fruit'<sup>11</sup> and not two or three fruits. [Its use] therefore is impossible. Rabbi said, Read not Hadar<sup>12</sup> but Ha-dir;<sup>13</sup> just as the stable contains large and small [animals], perfect and blemished ones, so also [the fruit spoken of<sup>8</sup> must have] large and small, perfect and blemished. Have not then other fruits large and small, perfect and blemished? —

It is this rather that was meant: Before the small ones<sup>14</sup> come, the large<sup>15</sup> are still existent [on the tree].<sup>16</sup> R. Abbahu<sup>17</sup> said, Read not Hadar,<sup>12</sup> but Ha-dar,<sup>18</sup> a fruit which remains upon its tree from year to year. Ben 'Azzai said, Read not Hadar, but Hudor<sup>19</sup> for in Greek water is called Hudor.<sup>19</sup> Now what fruit is it that grows by every water? Say, of course, it is the Ethrog.

**IF FROM AN ASHERAH OR FROM A CONDEMNED CITY, IT IS INVALID.** What is the reason? — Since it is condemned to be burnt, [it is considered as though] its minimum size is destroyed.<sup>20</sup>

**IF FROM 'ORLAH, IT IS INVALID.** What is the reason? R. Hiyya b. Abin and R. Assi disagree on this point. One explains because there is no permission to eat it,<sup>21</sup> and the other explains because it<sup>22</sup> has no monetary value.<sup>23</sup> It is now assumed that the authority who insists on permission to

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

eat it [in order to render it valid] does not insist upon [its having] monetary value,<sup>24</sup> and that he who insists upon monetary value does not insist upon permission to eat it.<sup>25</sup>

Now we learned, **OR OF UNCLEAN TERUMAH, IT IS INVALID.** This is well according to him who explains, because there is no permission to eat it,<sup>26</sup> but according to him who explains, because it has no monetary value,<sup>27</sup> why [should unclean Terumah be invalid] seeing that the man can kindle it under his cooking?<sup>28</sup> The fact is [that with regard to] permission to eat it, all agree that it is an essential,<sup>29</sup> and they disagree only on the question whether monetary value [is also necessary]. One Master is of the opinion that permission to eat it is necessary<sup>29</sup> but not monetary value, while the other Master is of the opinion that monetary value is also necessary. What is the practical difference between them? —

The case of the Second Tithe in Jerusalem differentiates them according to R. Meir.<sup>30</sup> According to him who explains, because there is no permission to eat it [it is valid, since] in this case there is permission to eat it. According to him who explains, because it has no monetary value [it is invalid, since] the Second Tithe is sacred money.<sup>31</sup> It may be concluded that it is R. Assi who gives [also] the reason that it has no monetary value,<sup>32</sup> since R. Assi said, [With] an Ethrog of the Second Tithe according to R. Meir,<sup>33</sup> a person cannot fulfill his obligation on the Festival, and according to the Sages<sup>34</sup> he may fulfill his obligation with it on the Festival.<sup>35</sup> This is proved.

[Turning to] the main text, R. Assi said: [With] an Ethrog of the Second Tithe, according to R. Meir, a person cannot fulfill his obligation on the Festival, and according to the Sages he may fulfill his obligation with it on the Festival. With unleavened bread of the Second Tithe,

according to R. Meir, a man cannot fulfill his obligation<sup>36</sup> on Passover,<sup>37</sup> and according to the Sages he may fulfill his obligation with it on the Passover. Dough of the Second Tithe, according to R. Meir, is exempt from Hallah;<sup>38</sup> according to the Sages it is liable to Hallah.

R. Papa demurred: This<sup>39</sup> is well with regard to dough, since it is written, Of the first of your dough.<sup>40</sup> With regard to the Ethrog also it is written, To you<sup>41</sup> [implying that — it should be yours.<sup>42</sup> With regard however to unleavened bread, does Scripture say, ‘your unleavened bread’? — Rabbah b. Samuel, or as some say, R. Yemar b. Shelemiah, replied. We deduce it from the word ‘bread’ which is common to both passages. In this connection it is written, The bread of affliction<sup>43</sup> and there<sup>44</sup> it is written,

- (1) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (2) Since ‘Ez (tree) or ‘wood’ and Peri (fruit) are in juxtaposition.
- (3) Lev. XIX, 23, the conclusion of which is ‘It shall not be eaten’.
- (4) Apparently we do.
- (5) Since Ma'akal (food) and ‘Ez (trees or ‘wood’) are in juxtaposition.
- (6) Though low and similar to a vegetable plant which is exempt from ‘Orlah.
- (7) Deut. VIII, 9.
- (8) In Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (9) With the festive wreath.
- (10) On account of its minute size.
- (11) Peri in the sing.
- (12) ‘Goodly’.
- (13) ‘The stable’.
- (14) Of the current year.
- (15) Of the previous year.
- (16) And this can refer to the Ethrog only whose fruit remains on the tree for two or three years.
- (17) Agreeing with Rabbi but adopting a different form of exposition.
- (18) ‘Which dwells’.
- (19) Cur. edd., ‘Idor’.
- (20) V. supra 31b.
- (21) Since it is prohibited for use, it does not come within the category of ‘yours’. Lakem (E.V., ‘unto you’).
- (22) Since it is forbidden to derive any benefit from it.
- (23) Cf. supra n. 15, mut. mut.

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

(24) Second Tithe, for instance, which may be eaten in Jerusalem would consequently be valid though it cannot be regarded as having monetary value since its owner according to R. Meir is not permitted to use it for such a purpose for instance as the betrothal of a wife (cf. Kid. 52b).

(25) An Ethrog of Tebel (v. Glos.) though forbidden to be eaten, would consequently be valid since benefit may be derived from it.

(26) Since unclean Terumah may not be eaten.

(27) While permission to eat it is of no consequence.

(28) Cf. Shab. 25b.

(29) To validity.

(30) Who regards Second Tithe as sacred, not secular money (Kid. 52b).

(31) Lit., 'of the Most High.' And is therefore not 'yours' (cf. supra p. 156. n. 15).

(32) Sc. that an Ethrog is invalid unless it satisfies both conditions, permissibility to eat it as well as the possession of monetary value and that an Ethrog of Second Tithe is, according to R. Meir, invalid.

(33) Who regards Second Tithe as sacred money.

(34) Who regard it as secular property.

(35) Pes. 38a.

(36) To eat unleavened bread.

(37) Sc. on the first night of the Festival.

(38) The separation of a portion of one's dough for the priest (v. Glos.). The reason is discussed infra.

(39) That the use of Second Tithe is invalid.

(40) Num. XV, 21; while Second Tithe is sacred and not entirely 'yours'.

(41) Lev. XXIII, 40.

(42) Cf. supra n. 5 mut. mut.

(43) Deut. XVI, 3.

(44) With regard to Hallah.

## Sukkah 35b

Then it shall be when ye eat of the bread of the land;<sup>1</sup> just as in the latter case [the reference is to] what is yours and not of the tithe, so in the former case, [it must be] yours and not of the tithe. Can we say that the following supports [this view]: Dough of the Second Tithe is exempt from Hallah, according to R. Meir, while the Sages say that it is liable?<sup>2</sup> — 'Can we say that the following supports [this view]?' Is it not the identical statement? Rather [say that the question was whether we can say that] since

they<sup>3</sup> dispute in this instance,<sup>4</sup> they also dispute in the others<sup>5</sup> or perhaps dough is exceptional because Scripture repeated the words 'your dough'.<sup>6</sup>

**OR OF UNCLEAN TERUMAH, IT IS INVALID;** because there is no permission to eat it.

**IF IT WAS OF CLEAN TERUMAH, HE SHOULD NOT TAKE IT.** R. Ammi and R. Assi disagree on the reason of the ruling. One explains, Because he [thereby]<sup>7</sup> renders it susceptible [to ritual uncleanness],<sup>8</sup> while the other explains. Because he depreciates its value.<sup>9</sup> What is the practical difference between them? The case where one assigned the name of Terumah to it<sup>10</sup> except to its outer peel. According to him who explains, Because he renders it susceptible [to ritual uncleanness], this<sup>11</sup> does apply;<sup>12</sup> according to him who explains, Because he depreciates its value, it<sup>13</sup> does not apply.<sup>14</sup>

**BUT IF HE DID TAKE IT, IT IS VALID;** [since] according to him who explains, Because there is no permission to eat it, this is permitted to be eaten,<sup>15</sup> and according to him who explains, Because it has no monetary value, this surely has monetary value.<sup>16</sup>

**IF IT WAS DEMAI.** What<sup>17</sup> is the reason of Beth Hillel?-Because, if he wishes, he may declare his property to be Hefker<sup>18</sup> and thereby become a pauper who is entitled to benefit [from Demai] we may now also apply to it the expression 'to you'. For we have learnt, Poor men and billeted troops may be fed with Demai.<sup>19</sup> [But on the view of] Beth Shammai<sup>20</sup> a poor man may not eat Demai; as we have learnt, Poor men and billeted troops may<sup>21</sup> eat Demai and R. Huna stated, A Tanna taught: Beth Shammai say that poor men and billeted troops may not be fed with Demai, while Beth Hillel say that poor men and billeted troops may be fed with Demai.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

**IF IT WAS OF SECOND TITHE... IN JERUSALEM.** According to him who explained,<sup>22</sup> Because he renders it susceptible [to uncleanness] it is [here forbidden] since he renders it susceptible [to uncleanness]; according to him who explained,<sup>22</sup> Because he depreciates its value [it is forbidden] since here also he depreciates its value.

**BUT IF HE TOOK IT, IT IS VALID.** According to him who explains,<sup>23</sup> Because there is no permission to eat it,<sup>24</sup> [the ruling]<sup>25</sup> is according to all.<sup>26</sup> According to him who explains,<sup>23</sup> Because it has no monetary value, according to whom [is the ruling]? According to the Rabbis.<sup>27</sup>

**IF THE LARGER PART OF IT IS COVERED WITH SCARS.** R. Hisda said, The following was said by our great Master,<sup>28</sup> may the Omnipresent be his help! This was taught only [where they were] in one place, but if they were in two or three places, [the Ethrog] is valid. Raba said,<sup>29</sup> On the contrary! If they were in two or three places the Ethrog is as though speckled and invalid. Rather if the statement was at all made, it was made in connection with the latter part [of our Mishnah]: **IF ITS LESSER PART ONLY IS COVERED WITH SCARS... IT IS VALID.** R. Hisda said, The following was said by our great Master, may the Omnipresent be his help! This was taught only [if they were] in one place, but if in two or three places the Ethrog is as speckled and invalid. Raba said, But [if a scar is] on the oblate part,<sup>30</sup> even if it is one of the slightest extent, the Ethrog is invalid.

**IF ITS NIPPLE IS REMOVED.** R. Isaac b. Eleazar<sup>31</sup> taught,<sup>32</sup> If its peduncle was removed.<sup>33</sup> **IF IT IS PEELED.** Raba ruled, An Ethrog which was peeled so as to resemble<sup>34</sup> a red date<sup>35</sup> is valid. But have we not learnt, **IF IT IS PEELED... IT IS INVALID?** — This is no difficulty,

- (2) Pes. 28a.
- (3) R. Meir and the Sages.
- (4) Hallah.
- (5) Ethrog and unleavened bread; bind thus support is afforded to R. Assi's submission.
- (6) In Num. XV, 20 and 21. In this case alone perhaps, where the fact that it must be one's property is emphasized, does R. Meir exempt it, but not in the case of Ethrog or unleavened bread where Scripture laid no such emphasis.
- (7) By using an Ethrog of Terumah in connection with the festive wreath.
- (8) An article is not susceptible to ritual uncleanness until it has come in contact with water. The Lulab is usually placed in water to keep it fresh (cf. infra 42a) and when the Ethrog comes in contact with the wet Lulab it also is rendered susceptible to similar uncleanness.
- (9) Since the peel of the Ethrog becomes damaged by use.
- (10) The Ethrog.
- (11) The prohibition to use it ab initio.
- (12) Since the entire Ethrog becomes susceptible.
- (13) The prohibition to use it ab initio.
- (14) Since the outer peel is no Terumah.
- (15) By a priest and, under certain conditions, by an Israelite also.
- (16) A priest and, under certain conditions an Israelite also, being permitted to betroth a woman with it.
- (17) Since Demai may not be eaten.
- (18) V. Glos.
- (19) Demai III, 1.
- (20) Who forbid the use of Demai.
- (21) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'not'.
- (22) Supra p. 159.
- (23) With regard to 'Orlah, supra.
- (24) And that the question of monetary value is of no consequence.
- (25) On Second Tithe.
- (26) Both the Sages who say that the Second Tithe is secular property and R. Meir who says it is sacred property, since in either case it may be eaten.
- (27) But (cf. prev. n.) not according to R. Meir.
- (28) Rab. (V. supra 33b).
- (29) Cf. Bah. Cur. edd. add 'to him'.
- (30) The part of the Ethrog which slopes towards the nipple.
- (31) In his Baraitha.
- (32) Instead of 'IF ITS NIPPLE', etc.
- (33) Reading Buknah instead of Pitmah.
- (34) In color, after it had been peeled.
- (35) Ahina, a kind of inferior dates.

(1) Num. XV, 19.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

## Sukkah 36a

since the former refers to where all of it [was peeled], the latter to where only a part was peeled.<sup>1</sup>

**SPLIT, PERFORATED.** ‘Ulla b. Hanina<sup>2</sup> learned,<sup>3</sup> If it is completely perforated [it is invalid even if the hole is] of the minutest size; if it is not completely perforated [the hole must be of the minimum size] of an Issar.<sup>4</sup> Raba enquired: If there developed in an Ethrog the symptoms [which render an animal] Terefah,<sup>4</sup> what is the law? — But concerning what does he inquire? If concerning [an Ethrog which is] peeled,<sup>5</sup> have we not [already] learnt it?<sup>6</sup> If concerning one that is split<sup>5</sup> have we not learnt it also?<sup>6</sup> If concerning one that is perforated.<sup>5</sup> have we not learnt it also?<sup>6</sup> —

The enquiry he raised was concerning [the law] ‘Ulla cited in the name of R. Johanan [who taught], If the [contents of the] lung pour out as from a ladle<sup>7</sup> [the animal] is fit to be eaten,<sup>8</sup> and Raba explained that this applies only when the arteries are still whole, but if the arteries are rotted [the animal is] Terefah. Now what is the ruling here?<sup>9</sup> Is it possible that this<sup>10</sup> applies to the former case only, where, since the air cannot affect it,<sup>11</sup> it could become healthy again,<sup>12</sup> but not in the latter case where, since the air can affect it, it inevitably decays, or is it possible that there is no difference? —

Come and hear: An Ethrog which is swollen, decayed, pickled, boiled, and Ethiopian,<sup>13</sup> white or speckled, is invalid. An Ethrog which is round as a ball is invalid. And some add if two are grown together. If an Ethrog is half-ripe, R. Akiba declares it invalid, and the Sages valid. If it was grown in a mold, so that it has the appearance of another species, it is invalid. At any rate it teaches ‘swollen or decayed’, which implies, does it not, swollen from without or decayed from within?<sup>14</sup> No!

Both refer to the exterior, and yet there is no discrepancy. The one refers to a case where the Ethrog is swollen even although it is not decayed; the other to a case where it was decayed without being swollen. The Master has said, An Ethiopian Ethrog is invalid. But has it not been taught, If it is Ethiopian it is valid, if it is like an Ethiopian,<sup>15</sup> it is invalid? —

Abaye answered, In our Mishnah also we learned of one that is like an Ethiopian. Raba answered, There is no difficulty. The former refers to us,<sup>16</sup> the latter to them.<sup>17</sup> A half-ripe Ethrog, R. Akiba declares invalid, and the Sages declare it valid. Rabbah observed, Both R. Akiba and R. Simeon say the same thing. As to R. Akiba there is the statement just quoted. But what is the ruling of R. Simeon? —

That which we have learnt:<sup>18</sup> R. Simeon declares Ethrogs to be exempt [from tithes] when they are small.<sup>19</sup> Said Abaye to him, But perhaps it is not so! R. Akiba may uphold his view only here, since the Ethrog must be ‘goodly’, which [an unripe Ethrog] is not, but there<sup>20</sup> he may hold the opinion of the Rabbis;<sup>21</sup> or else, R. Simeon may have maintained his view only here,<sup>20</sup> since it is written, Thou shalt surely tithe all the increase of thy seed,<sup>22</sup> [which confines liability to tithe to such fruit only] as men bring forth for sowing,<sup>23</sup> but in the present instance he might agree with the Rabbis,

(1) It is invalid since it is ‘speckled’.

(2) Var. lec. Hinena (Bah).

(3) In connection with the ruling. IF IT IS PERFORATED BUT NAUGHT OF IT IS MISSING.

(4) V. Glos.

(5) Certain organs, if peeled, split or perforated, cause an animal to be Terefah.

(6) In our Mishnah.

(7) Sc. the flesh inside is decayed and liquefied.

(8) Hul. 47b.

(9) In the case of the Ethrog. The seed kernels are regarded as corresponding with the arteries of the lungs.

(10) The permissibility.

(11) One of the internal organs.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(12) Were the animal alive. An injury which, were the animal alive, would disappear, does not render the animal Terefah.

(13) V. infra.

(14) In which case it can be compared to an organ which is sound outside, but decayed from within.

(15) I.e., black, but not grown in Ethiopia.

(16) Babylonians.

(17) In Palestine, Ethiopian Ethrogs are unknown and therefore they are declared invalid. In Babylon, Ethiopian Ethrogs were common and valid (Rashi).

(18) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'as it was taught'.

(19) Ma'as. I, 4.

(20) With regard to its liability to tithes.

(21) Who regard it as liable to tithes.

(22) Deut. XIV, 22.

(23) I.e., ripe fruit.

## Sukkah 36b

and there is nothing more [to say about it].<sup>1</sup> 'If it was grown in a mold, so that it has the appearance of another species, it is invalid.' Raba stated, They taught this Only in the case where 'it has the appearance of another species', but if it has its natural shape it is valid. But is not this obvious, seeing that it was taught,<sup>2</sup> 'the appearance of another species'? — It<sup>3</sup> was necessary only in a case where it<sup>4</sup> was molded in the shape of planks joined together.<sup>5</sup> It was stated: An Ethrog which has been gnawed by mice, Rab ruled, is no longer 'goodly'.<sup>6</sup> But it is not so? Did not R. Hanina in fact, taste a part of it,<sup>7</sup> and fulfilled his obligations [with the remainder]? — Does not then our Mishnah<sup>9</sup> present a contradiction against R. Hanina?<sup>10</sup> —

One might well explain that our Mishnah presents no contradiction against R. Hanina since the former might refer to the first day of the Festival,<sup>11</sup> while the latter might refer to the second day; but [does not R. Hanina's ruling<sup>12</sup> present] a contradiction against Rab?<sup>13</sup> —

Rab can answer you: [The gnawing by] mice is different, since they are repulsive. Others says, Rab ruled that it<sup>14</sup> is 'goodly' since R. Hanina tasted a part [of an Ethrog]

and fulfilled his obligation [with the remainder]. But does not our Mishnah present a contradiction against R. Hanina? — There is really no contradiction, since the former refers to the first day of the Festival, while the latter refers to the second day.

**THE MINIMUM SIZE OF AN ETHROG, etc.** Rafram b. Papa observed: As is the dispute<sup>15</sup> here, so is the dispute with regard to rounded pebbles. For it has been taught, It is permitted on the Sabbath<sup>16</sup> to carry three rounded smooth pebbles<sup>17</sup> into [a field] lavatory.<sup>18</sup> And what must be their size? R. Meir ruled, The size of a nut, R. Judah ruled, That of an egg.

**THE MAXIMUM SIZE, etc.** It was taught: R. Jose related, It happened with R. Akiba that he came to Synagogue with his Ethrog on his shoulder.<sup>19</sup> R. Judah answered him,<sup>20</sup> Is this a proof? They<sup>21</sup> in fact said to him, This Ethrog is not 'goodly'.

**MISHNAH. THE LULAB<sup>22</sup> MAY BE BOUND ONLY WITH [STRANDS OF] ITS OWN SPECIES; SO R. JUDAH. R. MEIR SAYS IT MAY BE BOUND EVEN WITH A CORD.<sup>23</sup> R. MEIR OBSERVED, IT ACTUALLY OCCURRED THAT THE MEN<sup>24</sup> OF JERUSALEM USED TO BIND THEIR LULABS WITH STRANDS OF GOLD. THEY<sup>25</sup> ANSWERED HIM, BUT THEY BOUND IT WITH [STRANDS OF] ITS OWN SPECIES UNDERNEATH [THE STRANDS OF GOLD].<sup>26</sup>**

**GEMARA.** Raba stated, A Lulab may be bound even with bast, or even with [strips of] the roots of the date-palm. Raba further stated, What is the reason of R. Judah? He is of the opinion that the Lulab<sup>22</sup> must be bound so that if one uses another species, the wreath would contain five species.<sup>27</sup> Raba further stated, Whence do I deduce that bast and roots of date-palms are species of the palm-tree? From what has been taught: [It is written,] Ye shall dwell

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

in Sukkoth [booths],<sup>28</sup> which implies a Sukkah<sup>29</sup> made of any material; so R. Meir.

R. Judah ruled, The Sukkah must be made of the same four species as the Lulab. And logic demands it: If the Lulab which does not obtain by night as by day,<sup>30</sup> is valid only with the Four Species, is there not then much more reason that the Sukkah which obtains both by night and by day,<sup>30</sup> shall be valid only with the Four Species? They answered him, Any a fortiori argument which begins with a restriction [of the law] and concludes with a relaxation [of it]<sup>31</sup> is no valid argument.<sup>32</sup>

- (1) Sc. no further arguments can be advanced since R. Simeon need not agree with R. Akiba nor need the latter agree with the former.
- (2) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'we learned'.
- (3) Raba's statement.
- (4) The Ethrog.
- (5) 'Angular' (Jast.) 'in the shape of the wheel of a water mill' (Rashi); Raba's view being that such a shape may be regarded as natural.
- (6) Cf. Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (7) Lit., 'differed with it', sc. in some relish.
- (8) Of taking the festive wreath.
- (9) Which ruled an Ethrog any part of which is missing to be invalid.
- (10) Who, as stated, used an Ethrog after a part of it had been removed.
- (11) When, in accordance with an exposition of 'and ye shall take' in Lev. XXIII, 40, the Ethrog must be whole.
- (12) According to which an Ethrog a part of which is missing is fit at least for the second day.
- (13) Who does not regard such an Ethrog as 'goodly', and consequently it is invalid even on the second day of the festival, v. supra 29b.
- (14) An Ethrog gnawed by mice.
- (15) Between R. Meir and R. Judah on the minimum size of an Ethrog.
- (16) When the carrying of an object in certain domains is forbidden.
- (17) To cleanse oneself.
- (18) Which has no walls and the movement of objects into it on the Sabbath is otherwise Rabbinically forbidden.
- (19) Owing to its huge size; which proves that there is no maximum size.
- (20) R. Jose.
- (21) The Rabbis at the Synagogue.
- (22) Sc. the festive wreath consisting of the palm, myrtle and willow-branches.

(23) So separate edd. of the Mishnah, Alfasi and Asheri. Cur. edd. insert, 'with a thread'.

(24) [יקירי ירושלם MS.M. אנשי ירושלם] 'The nobility'. V. infra p. 166, n. 3. Klein, S. מדעי היהדות I, p. 72ff regards both these terms as synonymous with נקיי הדעת. V. Sanh., Sonc. ed., p. 131, n. 3].

(25) The Rabbis at the College.

(26) The former serving as binders and the latter as mere ornaments.

(27) Instead of the four prescribed in Lev. XXIII, 40. It is forbidden to add to a commandment.

(28) Lev. XXIII, 42.

(29) I.e., the Sukkah-covering.

(30) V. infra 43a for proof.

(31) As will soon be illustrated.

(32) Since the ultimate effect of the restriction is a relaxation.

## Sukkah 37a

For suppose he could not find all the Four Species, he would be sitting and doing nothing<sup>1</sup> while the Torah said, 'Ye shall dwell in booths for seven days.' implying a Sukkah of whatever material. And so with Ezra it says, Go forth unto the mount, and fetch olive branches, and branches of wild olive, and myrtle branches and palm-branches, and branches of thick trees to make Sukkoth, as it is written.<sup>2</sup> And [what does] R. Judah [answer to this verse?] —

He is of the opinion that the other [species] were for the walls, while the 'myrtle branches and palm-branches and branches of thick trees' were for Sukkah — covering. And [nevertheless] we have learnt, Planks may be used as a Sukkah-covering, these are the words of R. Judah.<sup>3</sup> Thus<sup>4</sup> it clearly follows that bast and roots of date-palms<sup>5</sup> are a species of palm-tree.<sup>6</sup> This is conclusive. But did R. Judah rule that the Four Species alone [are valid]<sup>7</sup> and not anything else? —

Was it not in fact taught, 'If he covered it with planks of cedar wood which are four handbreadths wide, it is invalid according to all.<sup>9</sup> If they are not four handbreadths wide, R. Meir declares it invalid and R. Judah valid, but R. Meir admits that, if

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

there is a space of one plank between every two planks, he may place laths between them and the Sukkah is valid'?<sup>10</sup> —

What is meant by 'cedar'? Myrtle. This is in agreement with Rabbah son of R. Huna, since Rabbah son of R. Huna stated, In the school of Rab<sup>11</sup> they said that there were ten species of cedar, as it is said, I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia tree, and the myrtle, etc.<sup>12</sup>

**R. MEIR SAYS EVEN WITH A CORD.** It has been taught: R. Meir said, It occurred with the nobility<sup>13</sup> of Jerusalem that they bound their Lulabs with [strands of] gold. They said to him, Is that evidence? They bound it in fact with strands of its own species underneath.<sup>14</sup> Rabbah said to those who bind the Hoshanna<sup>15</sup> at the house of the Exilarch, 'When you bind the Hoshannas at the house of the Exilarch, [be careful to] leave a handle<sup>16</sup> so that<sup>17</sup> there should be no interposition'.<sup>18</sup>

Raba [however] ruled, Whatever is used to beautify it<sup>19</sup> constitutes no interposition. Rabbah further stated, A man shall not hold the Hoshanna<sup>20</sup> with a scarf, because it is required that the 'taking'<sup>21</sup> shall be complete, and in this case it is not.

Raba, however, ruled, Taking hold by means of something else is also regarded as a valid 'taking'. Whence, said Raba, do I derive that taking hold by means of something else is also regarded as a valid taking? From what we have learnt: If the hyssop<sup>22</sup> is too short,<sup>23</sup> it may be made to suffice with a thread or with a reed and so it is dipped and brought up, but one must hold the hyssop itself when sprinkling.<sup>24</sup> Now why [is this<sup>25</sup> permitted]? Did not the Divine Law say, And he shall take hyssop and dip?<sup>26</sup> May we not then deduce therefrom that taking hold by means of something else is also regarded as a valid 'taking'?<sup>27</sup> —

But whence the proof? That case<sup>28</sup> perhaps is different; since [the thread or reed] was joined on [to the hyssop],<sup>29</sup> it is regarded as part of it? — In fact [the deduction is made] from the following: [If the ashes of the Red Heifer] fell [of their own accord] from their tube into the trough they are invalid.<sup>30</sup>

- (1) Sc. would be deprived of the performance of the precept of Sukkah.
- (2) Neh. VIII, 15.
- (3) Supra 14a.
- (4) Since only that which is valid for the Lulab is valid for the Sukkah.
- (5) Which, in view of R. Judah's restrictions, must be understood to be the material of the planks which he permits for Sukkah-covering.
- (6) Had they not been that, they would have been invalid for the Sukkah as well as for the Lulab.
- (7) As a Sukkah-covering.
- (8) A Sukkah.
- (9) I.e., even according to R. Judah.
- (10) Supra 17b.
- (11) Be-rab may also mean simply 'in the school'.
- (12) Isa. XLI, 19, which shows that myrtle is also called cedar.
- (13) V. supra p. 164, n. 9.
- (14) So that the gold bands above them served as a mere ornament.
- (15) The term is used for the myrtle or the entire festive wreath, here it is to be understood in the latter sense.
- (16) Below the binding.
- (17) When the wreath is held in the performance of the precept.
- (18) Between the hand of the holder and the wreath. Rabbah holds that according to Pentateuchal law, the binding is unnecessary hence it would form an interposition between one's hand and the wreath.
- (19) The wreath.
- (20) V. supra n. 7.
- (21) With reference to Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (22) Used for the sprinkling of the water containing the ashes of the Red Heifer. V. Num. XIX, 6.
- (23) To reach the level of the water in the tube.
- (24) Parah XII, 1.
- (25) Dipping the hyssop by means of a thread or reed.
- (26) Num. XIX. 18, the verb 'to take' being used here as in the case of the Lulab.
- (27) Nevertheless, in order that he may have a firmer grasp of it for the better sprinkling, he



# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

must take hold of the hyssop itself when performing the lustration.

(28) Parah XII, 1.

(29) I.e., to lengthen it.

(30) Parah VI, 1. The ashes were carried in tubes from which they were emptied into a stone trough containing tile water. If the ashes fall into the water of their own accord they become invalid since the putting into the water must be done with intention.

## Sukkah 37b

From this it follows that if the man himself threw them into the water they are [presumably] valid.<sup>1</sup> Now why [should that be so]? Did not the Divine Law say, And they shall take of the ashes... and he shall put?<sup>2</sup> May we not then<sup>3</sup> deduce that taking by means of something else is also regarded as a valid 'taking'.

Rabbah further stated, One should not thrust the palm-branch through the bound willow and myrtle<sup>4</sup> lest some leaves are detached and thus form an interposition.<sup>5</sup> Raba, however, ruled, A thing of the same species does not constitute an interposition.

Rabbah further stated, One should not shear the palm-branch while it is in the wreath,<sup>4</sup> since loose leaves<sup>6</sup> might remain and form an interposition,<sup>5</sup> Raba however ruled, A thing of the same species does not constitute an interposition.

Rabbah further stated, it is forbidden to smell<sup>7</sup> a myrtle branch [used] for the [fulfillment of the] commandment,<sup>8</sup> but it is permitted to smell an Ethrog [used] for the [fulfillment of the] commandment. What is the reason? — The myrtle — since it is used as perfume, when it is set apart [for ritual purposes] is set apart from [use as a] perfume: the Ethrog, however, since it is used as food, when it is set apart [for ritual purposes] it is set apart [only] from [use as] food.

Rabbah further stated, If a myrtle is attached to the ground, it may be smelt;<sup>9</sup> if

an Ethrog is attached to the ground, it may not be smelt. What is the reason? — The myrtle, since it is used as a perfume,<sup>10</sup> [even] if you permit it [to be smelt], the man would not be tempted to cut it; the Ethrog, however, since it is used for food, if you permit it [to be smelt] the man might be tempted<sup>11</sup> to cut it.<sup>12</sup>

Rabbah further stated, The Lulab [must be held]<sup>13</sup> in the right hand and the Ethrog in the left. What is the reason? The former constitutes three commandments<sup>14</sup> and the latter only one.<sup>15</sup>

R. Jeremiah enquired of R. Zerika, Why in the blessing<sup>16</sup> do we say only 'To take the palm-branch'?<sup>17</sup> — Because it towers above the others. Then<sup>18</sup> why should not one lift up the Ethrog and recite the blessing over it? — The reason is, the other answered him, that as a species it naturally towers above all of them.

*MISHNAH.* AND WHERE<sup>19</sup> IS [THE LULAB] WAVED? AT THE COMMENCEMENT AND THE CONCLUSION OF THE PSALM, O GIVE THANKS UNTO THE LORD<sup>20</sup> AND AT SAVE NOW, WE BESEECH THEE, O LORD.<sup>21</sup> THESE ARE THE WORDS OF BETH HILLEL. BETH SHAMMAI SAY, ALSO AT O LORD WE BESEECH THEE, SEND NOW PROSPERITY.<sup>22</sup> R. AKIBA STATED, I WATCHED R. GAMALIEL AND R. JOSHUA, AND WHILE ALL THE PEOPLE WERE WAVING THEIR LULABS [AT OTHER VERSES], THEY WAVED THEM ONLY AT SAVE NOW, WE BESEECH THEE, O LORD.<sup>22</sup>

*GEMARA.* Who has ever mentioned the name of waving [of the Lulab]?<sup>23</sup> — It was mentioned previously:<sup>24</sup> A Lulab which has a length of three handbreadths, sufficient to wave with it, is valid,<sup>25</sup> and in reference to this the Mishnah says, AND WHERE IS THE LULAB WAVED? We have learnt elsewhere, As to the Two Loaves<sup>26</sup> and the Two Lambs of Pentecost,<sup>27</sup> how does one

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

proceed? [The priest] places the two loaves upon the two lambs and places his hands beneath them and waves them forwards and backwards, upwards and downwards, as it is said, Which is waved<sup>28</sup> and which is heaved<sup>29</sup> up.<sup>30</sup>

R. Johanan explained, [One waves them] to and fro [in honor of] Him to Whom the four directions belong, and up and down [in acknowledgment of] Him to Whom are Heaven and Earth. In Palestine<sup>31</sup> they taught us thus: R. Hama b. 'Ukba stated in the name of R. Jose son of R. Hanina, He waves them to and fro in order to restrain harmful winds; up and down, in order to restrain harmful dews. R. Jose b. Abin, or, as some say, R. Jose b. Zebila, observed, This implies

- (1) Though, as in the case when they fell of their own accord, the man did not hold the ashes themselves but only the tube which contained them.
- (2) Num. XIX, 17, the verb 'to take' being used.
- (3) Since taking by means of a tube is here regarded as a valid taking.
- (4) Lit., 'Hoshanna' v. supra, p. 166, n. 5.
- (5) Between the components of the wreath.
- (6) Of the Lulab.
- (7) During the seven days of the Festival.
- (8) Of Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (9) This refers to the Sabbath. There is no need to fear that the man might be tempted to cut it down and thus transgress the Sabbath.
- (10) And can well be enjoyed without plucking it.
- (11) By its fragrance.
- (12) In order to eat it. Cutting or even biting off a growing fruit is an act forbidden on the Sabbath.
- (13) When the precept, Lev. XXIII, 40, is fulfilled.
- (14) Those of the palm, the myrtle and the willow which are bound together.
- (15) The right hand is regarded as the more important, and in it, therefore, one must hold the more important part of the species.
- (16) On taking the Four Species of which the palm-branch is one.
- (17) Omitting all mention of the others. Cf. P.B. p. 218.
- (18) Since it is merely altitude that determines the blessing.

- (19) In the course of the recital of the Hallel Psalms (CXIII-CXVIII) on Tabernacles.
- (20) Ps. CXVIII.
- (21) Ibid. 25.
- (22) Ps. CXVIII, 25.
- (23) Apparently none. Why then does our Mishnah tacitly assume that the Lulab is to be waved.
- (24) Lit., 'there he stands'.
- (25) Supra 29b.
- (26) Cf. Lev. XXIII, 16f.
- (27) Ibid. 20.
- (28) Referring to the first two movements.
- (29) Referring to the last two.
- (30) Ex. XXIX, 27.
- (31) Lit., 'West'.

## Sukkah 38a

that even the dispensable parts<sup>1</sup> of a commandment<sup>2</sup> prevent calamities; for the waving is obviously a dispensable part of the commandment,<sup>3</sup> and yet it shuts out harmful winds and harmful dews. In connection with this Raba remarked, And so with the Lulab.<sup>4</sup> R. Aha b. Jacob used to wave its to and fro, saying, 'This<sup>5</sup> is an arrow in the eye of Satan'.<sup>7</sup> This, however, is not a proper thing [for a man to do] since [Satan] might in consequence be provoked [to let temptation loose] against him.

**MISHNAH.** IF A MAN WAS ON A JOURNEY<sup>8</sup> AND HAD NO LULAB WHEREWITH TO PERFORM THE PRESCRIBED COMMANDMENT,<sup>9</sup> WHEN HE COMES HOME HE SHOULD TAKE IT [EVEN IF HE IS] AT TABLE.<sup>10</sup> IF HE DID NOT TAKE THE LULAB IN THE MORNING, HE SHOULD TAKE IT AT ANY TIME BEFORE DUSK, SINCE THE WHOLE DAY<sup>11</sup> IS VALID FOR [TAKING] THE LULAB.

**GEMARA.** You said that he should take it [even if he is] AT TABLE. This then means that he must interrupt [his meal for the purpose]. But is not this in contradiction with the ruling,<sup>12</sup> If they have begun<sup>13</sup> they need not interrupt [it]?<sup>14</sup> —

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

R. Safra replied, There is no contradiction: The latter statement refers to where there is still time [to perform the commandment] during the day, while the former refers to where there is [otherwise] no time.

Raba retorted, What difficulty is this?<sup>15</sup> Is it not possible [that the difference in ruling is due to the fact that] the former<sup>5</sup> is a Pentateuchal commandment<sup>16</sup> while the latter<sup>17</sup> is only Rabbinical? Rather, said Raba, if a difficulty at all exists, it is this: [The ruling] HE SHOULD TAKE IT WHEN HE COMES HOME [EVEN IF HE IS] AT TABLE, clearly shows that he must interrupt [his meal], while [the ruling] subsequently taught, IF HE DID NOT TAKE IT DURING THE MORNING HE SHOULD TAKE IT AT ANY TIME BEFORE DUSK shows, [does it not], that he need not interrupt [his meal]?

[To this] R. Safra might well reply, There is no difficulty: The latter refers to where there is still time during the day, the former where there is [otherwise] no time.

R. Zera retorted, What difficulty is this?<sup>18</sup> Perhaps it is a religious duty to interrupt [one's meal for the purpose of taking the Lulab] but if one did not interrupt it one should take [the Lulab] at any time before dusk, since the whole day is valid for the taking of the Lulab?

Rather, said R. Zera, [The incongruity] indeed is as we said previously;<sup>19</sup> and with regard to your difficulty [why the reply was not given<sup>20</sup> that] the former was a Pentateuchal commandment while the latter was only Rabbinical,<sup>21</sup> the fact is that here we are dealing with the second day of the Festival [the obligation of taking the Lulab on] which is only Rabbinical.<sup>22</sup> A deduction [from the wording of our Mishnah] also [shows that this is so], since it teaches IF A MAN WAS ON A JOURNEY AND HAD NO LULAB WHEREWITH TO PERFORM THE

PRESCRIBED COMMANDMENT. Now if it could possibly have been assumed to refer to the first day of the Festival, [the difficulty would arise] is it permitted [to travel on that day]?<sup>23</sup>

*MISHNAH.* IF A SLAVE, A WOMAN, OR A MINOR RECITED [THE HALLEL]<sup>24</sup> TO HIM, HE MUST REPEAT AFTER THEM WHAT THEY SAY,<sup>25</sup> (AND A CURSE BE UPON HIM).<sup>26</sup> IF A MAJOR RECITED TO HIM, HE REPEATS AFTER HIM [ONLY] HALLELUJAH.<sup>26</sup> WHERE THE CUSTOM OBTAINS TO REPEAT [THE VERSES],<sup>27</sup> HE SHOULD REPEAT; [WHERE THE CUSTOM IS] TO SAY THEM ONLY ONCE, HE SHOULD SAY THEM ONCE; [WHERE THE CUSTOM OBTAINS] TO RECITE THE BENEDICTION,<sup>28</sup> HE SHOULD RECITE THE BENEDICTION. EVERYTHING IS DEPENDENT ON LOCAL CUSTOM.

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis have taught, It has truly<sup>29</sup> been laid down that a [minor] son<sup>30</sup> may recite [the Grace after meals] for his father,<sup>31</sup> a slave may recite it for his master, and a wife for her husband; but the Sages said, May a curse come upon that man whose wife and [minor] sons have to recite the benediction for him!<sup>32</sup>

Raba observed,

- (1) Lit., 'remnants'.
- (2) There are parts of a commandment whose performance is indispensable to the due fulfillment of that commandment, and the neglect to perform which renders it invalid. Others are prescribed but dispensable. The waving belongs to the latter category.
- (3) Cf. Yoma 5a.
- (4) It also must be waved to and fro, up and down.
- (5) The Lulab.
- (6) The performance of God's commandments of which that of Lulab is one.
- (7) Whose aim is the seduction of man.
- (8) During the festival of Tabernacles.
- (9) Lit., 'in his hand... to take'.
- (10) Sc. if he did not remember it until he began his meal, he must interrupt his meal and take the Lulab forthwith.
- (11) The night only excluded.

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

## Sukkah 38b

(12) In connection with the reading of the afternoon prayer.

(13) Any of the acts (including that of eating) which must not be begun before the afternoon prayer has been read.

(14) Shab. 9b.

(15) To which R. Safra had to give an almost arbitrary answer.

(16) Being Pentateuchal it is more rigid than a Rabbinical rule. A meal must consequently be interrupted for its sake at all times.

(17) Statutory daily prayer.

(18) The one raised by Raba.

(19) That between our Mishnah and that of Shab. 9b.

(20) By R. Safra.

(21) The answer suggested by Raba.

(22) The Pentateuchal commandment referring only to the first day (cf. supra 30b). Hence the necessity for R. Safra's reply.

(23) The reference consequently must be to the second day when the duty of taking the Lulab, like that of the daily statutory prayers, is only Rabbinical.

(24) Ps. CXIII-CXVIII.

(25) The Reader used to read the Hallel, and the congregation responded only with certain words (v. infra). Since, however, a minor, a slave and a woman are exempt from the Hallel, they cannot officiate for others, and each individual must repeat it after them word for word. (9) That he has not learnt to read himself, or if he has learnt, that he makes use in divine service of inferior or second rate deputies.

(26) For the words or passages after which the response is to be made cf. Sot. 30b. For a full discussion of the mode of recital, cf. I. W. Slotki, 'Antiphony in Ancient Hebr. Poetry'. JQR., N.S., vol. XXVI, pp. 199-219.

(27) Of Ps. CXVIII, 21-29. Lit., 'to double'.

(28) At the conclusion of the Hallel. The opening benediction is obligatory.

(29) Be'emeth, a formula introducing a generally accepted ruling.

(30) Who has attained the age of training, and who is subject to the duty of saying Grace after meals by Rabbinic law.

(31) This is explained in Ber. 20b to refer to one who ate only a small quantity of bread and who, like his son, is consequently obliged to say Grace after it by a Rabbinic law only. The two being subject to the same Rabbinic law, the latter may well exempt the former (cf. Ber. 20b).

(32) Cf. relevant note on our Mishnah.

One can deduce important decisions from the [present] custom of [reciting the] Hallel.<sup>1</sup> [Thus], since he<sup>2</sup> says Hallelujah<sup>3</sup> and they respond Hallelujah,<sup>4</sup> it may be inferred that it is a religious duty<sup>5</sup> to answer Hallelujah.<sup>6</sup> Since he<sup>7</sup> says, Praise Him, ye servants of the Lord,<sup>8</sup> and they [again] respond Hallelujah,<sup>9</sup> it may be deduced that if a major recites [the Hallel] for one the latter<sup>10</sup> responds Hallelujah.<sup>11</sup> Since he<sup>7</sup> says, Give thanks unto the Lord,<sup>12</sup> and they respond, Give thanks unto the Lord, it may be inferred that it is a religious duty<sup>10</sup> to make a response of the beginning of the sections.<sup>13</sup> (So it was also stated; R. Hanan b. Raba ruled, It is a religious duty to make a response of the beginning of the sections.) Since he<sup>14</sup> says, Save now, we beseech Thee, O Lord,<sup>15</sup> and they<sup>16</sup> answer, Save now, we beseech Thee, O Lord,<sup>17</sup> it may be inferred that if a minor was reciting it for him, the latter<sup>18</sup> answers after him what he says.<sup>19</sup> Since he<sup>14</sup> says, O Lord, we beseech Thee, send now prosperity,<sup>15</sup> and they<sup>16</sup> respond O, Lord we beseech Thee, send now prosperity, it may be inferred that if a man wishes to double [the verses] he may.<sup>20</sup> Since he<sup>14</sup> says, Blessed be he that cometh,<sup>21</sup> and they<sup>22</sup> answer, In the name of the Lord,<sup>21</sup> it may be inferred that he who hearkens is as though he responded.<sup>20</sup>

They enquired of R. Hiyya b. Abba, If one listened but did not make the responses — what is the law?<sup>23</sup> — He answered them, The Sages, the Scribes,<sup>24</sup> the leaders of the people and the expounders laid down that if a man listened though he did not make the responses he has fulfilled his obligation. So it was also stated:<sup>25</sup> R. Simeon b. Pazzi citing R. Joshua b. Levi who had it from Bar Kappara stated, Whence do we know that he who listens is as though he responds? From what is written, Even all the words of the book<sup>26</sup> which the King of Judah<sup>27</sup> hath read.<sup>28</sup> For was it Josiah that

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

read them? Was it not, in fact Shaphan who read them, as it is written, And Shaphan read it<sup>29</sup> before the king.<sup>30</sup> Consequently it may be inferred that he who listens is as though he responds. But perhaps Josiah read it after Shaphan had read it? —

**R. Aha b. Jacob** replied, This cannot be thought of, since it is written, Because thy heart was tender, and thou didst humble thyself before the Lord, when thou heardest<sup>29</sup> what I spake;<sup>31</sup> "When thou heardest", not 'when thou didst read'. Raba ruled, One should not say Blessed be he that cometh<sup>32</sup> and then [pause and] say 'in the name of the Lord,'<sup>32</sup> but 'Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord'<sup>32</sup> all together.<sup>33</sup> (R. Safra said to him,

(1) [In former days it was customary for the congregation to rely on the Reader for the recital of the Hallel, and in order to enable them to participate actively in the recital, a number of customs were introduced. In the days of Raba the congregation read it themselves, yet certain features of the former procedure were retained as reminders.]

(2) The Reader who leads the congregation in prayer.

(3) The first Hallelujah introducing the Hallel.

(4) [While the Reader does not proceed until the congregation has responded. This was the custom in Raba's place; v. Rashi and Tosaf.]

(5) For the whole congregation including even those who recite the Hallel themselves.

(6) After the Reader had said it.

(7) The Reader who leads the congregation in prayer.

(8) Ps. CXIII, 1.

(9) This too was the custom that obtained in Raba's place, though the congregation subsequently recited the Hallel themselves, v. n. 7.

(10) Where he relies on the Reader to recite it for him.

(11) [I.e., after every clause. As a reminder of this custom the congregants in the days of Raba responded Hallelujah after 'Praise him, ye servants of the Lord'. This custom is not followed nowadays.]

(12) Ps. CXVIII, 1.

(13) Whereas the mere response of Hallelujah is sufficient for single clauses, this is not enough for the beginning of the sections.

(14) The Reader who recites to the congregation in the Synagogue.

(15) Ps. CXVIII, 25.

(16) Though they subsequently recite themselves all the Psalm.

(17) Thus repeating every word though it forms no part of the beginning of a section.

(18) [Lit., 'he answers'. So MS.M.; cur. edd. 'They answer'.]

(19) This custom (which is still retained to the present day) serving as a reminder of the original one when a minor may have acted as Reader.

(20) Cf. supra n. 15 mut. mut.

(21) Ps. CXVIII, 26.

(22) Neither repeating what the Reader has said nor responding Hallelujah. This custom does not obtain nowadays.

(23) Sc. Has that man thereby fulfilled his duty.

(24) Or 'elementary teachers' (Rashi).

(25) By Amoras.

(26) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'the words'.

(27) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'Josiah'.

(28) II Kings XXII, 16.

(29) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'all these words'.

(30) Ibid.10.

(31) Ibid. 19.

(32) Ps. CXVIII, 26.

(33) Only in antiphonal chant is the breaking up of the distich allowed.

## Sukkah 39a

'Moses!<sup>1</sup> Do you speak aright? The fact is that both here and there,<sup>2</sup> it<sup>3</sup> is the conclusion of the clause and the pause does not matter'.<sup>4</sup> Raba ruled, One should not say,<sup>5</sup> 'May His great Name' and then [pause and] say, 'be blessed' but 'May His great Name be blessed' all together. R. Safra said to him, 'Moses!<sup>1</sup> Do you speak aright? The fact is that both here and there<sup>6</sup> it<sup>7</sup> is the conclusion of the clause and the pause does not matter'.

**WHERE THE CUSTOM OBTAINS TO REPEAT.** It was taught, Rabbi used to repeat [certain] words in it;<sup>8</sup> R. Eleazar b. Perata used to augment [certain] words in it.<sup>9</sup> What is meant by 'augment'? — Abaye explained, He augmented the doubling beginning with 'I will give thanks unto Thee'<sup>10</sup> to the end of the Psalm.<sup>11</sup>

**[WHERE THE CUSTOM OBTAINS] TO RECITE THE BENEDICTION, HE**

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

**SHOULD RECITE THE BENEDICTION.** Abaye explained, This was taught only with regard to the concluding benediction,<sup>12</sup> but with regard to the preceding benediction,<sup>12</sup> it is a positive commandment to say it, for Rab Judah citing Samuel ruled, With all commandments the benediction is to be recited ‘Ober [prior] to their performance. And whence do we know that the word ‘Ober means prior? —

**R.13 Nahman b. Isaac** replied, Since it is written, Then Ahimaaz ran by the way of the plain and he overran<sup>14</sup> the Cushite.<sup>15</sup> Abaye said the inference is from the following verse. And he himself passed over<sup>16</sup> before them.<sup>17</sup> And if you wish, you may infer from the verse, And their king is passed<sup>18</sup> on before them, and the Lord at the head of them.<sup>19</sup>

**MISHNAH.** IF A MAN PURCHASE A LULAB<sup>20</sup> FROM HIS FELLOW<sup>21</sup> IN THE SABBATICAL YEAR THE LATTER SHOULD GIVE HIM THE ETHROG AS A GIFT, SINCE ONE IS NOT PERMITTED TO PURCHASE IT IN THE SABBATICAL YEAR.<sup>22</sup>

**GEMARA.** What is the position if the other<sup>23</sup> is unwilling to give him it<sup>24</sup> as a gift? — R. Huna replied, He should include<sup>25</sup> the price of the Ethrog in that of the palm-branch.<sup>26</sup> But why should he not pay him directly?<sup>27</sup> — Because one must not hand over money for fruit of the Sabbatical Year to an ‘Am ha-arez.<sup>28</sup> For it has been taught, A man must not hand over money to an ‘Am ha-arez for fruit of the Sabbatical Year<sup>29</sup> more than is sufficient for three meals,<sup>30</sup> but if he handed [him] over [more]<sup>31</sup> he should say, ‘This money<sup>32</sup> shall be exchanged<sup>33</sup> for [the ordinary] fruit which I have in my house’<sup>34</sup>

(1) Either a flattering title given to Raba by R. Safra, or a form of oath.

(2) Perhaps meaning in ordinary, as in antiphonal recital (cf. supra n. 10). [MS.M. however omits ‘both here and there’; v. n. 16.]

(3) The second member of the clause (distich).

(4) Rashal omits the passage in parenthesis.

(5) When reciting the Kaddish (cf. P.B. p. 75f).

(6) If the previous statement of R. Safra is to be deleted with Rashal (cf. supra n. 14) the meaning will be both ‘here’ in the case of the Kaddish and ‘there’ in that of Ps. CXVIII, 26. V. Maharam.

(7) The second half of the sentence.

(8) From Ps. CXVIII, 25 to the end of the Psalm.

(9) I.e., to those doubled by Rabbi.

(10) Ps. CXVIII, 21.

(11) Cf. I. W. Slotki, ‘The Stichometry and Text of the Great Hallel’, J.T.S., p. 261f.

(12) Of the Hallel.

(13) Cur. edd. ‘because R.’.

(14) Waya'abor, of the same rt. as ‘Ober.

(15) II Sam. XVIII, 23.

(16) ‘Abar.

(17) Gen. XXXIII. 3.

(18) V. supra n. 7.

(19) Mic. II, 13.

(20) Sc. the festive wreath.

(21) Who was an ‘Am ha-arez (Rashi; cf. Tosaf. a.l.).

(22) During the Seventh Year of release, it is forbidden to purchase fruit which has grown that year. The Ethrog alone of the Four Species is a fruit. V. Lev. XXV, 1-7. The Gemara (infra 39b) discusses the palm-branch.

(23) The seller.

(24) The Ethrog.

(25) Lit., ‘cause to swallow up’.

(26) He gives a price, ostensibly for the other three species, sufficient to cover the cost of all four.

(27) For the Ethrog.

(28) V. Glos.

(29) With which it is forbidden to trade, and any money obtained from trading with Sabbatical Year fruit must be consumed in the Sabbatical Year. But an ‘Am ha-arez is suspected to trade with the money or hoard it for another year.

(30) To enable him to enjoy the prescribed number of Sabbath meals; and since this was permitted for the Sabbath it was also permitted for any other day of the week.

(31) So that there is reason to fear that the ‘Am ha-arez will trade with that money.

(32) Which is in excess of that required for three meals.

(33) Lit., ‘profaned’.

(34) The money thus loses all sanctity.

## Sukkah 39b

and [the purchaser] eats the fruit<sup>1</sup> [as though it has] the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year. This<sup>2</sup> however, applies only where one buys from what is Hefker,<sup>3</sup> but if one

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

buys from protected produce<sup>4</sup> its is forbidden [to buy] even for as little as half an Issar.

R. Shesheth objected, And [if a man buys] from what is Hefker [may he pay, you say, for] three meals and no more? I will point out contradictions: Rue, asparagus, fenugreek,<sup>6</sup> coriander of the mountains, water-parsley and meadow-eruca are always exempt from tithe and may be bought from anyone<sup>7</sup> in the Sabbatical Year, since the like of these is not guarded.<sup>8</sup> He<sup>9</sup> raised the objection and he himself replied to it: They<sup>10</sup> taught [that only as much as is] sufficient for one's food<sup>11</sup> [may be bought]. And so said Rabbah b. bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan. They<sup>10</sup> taught [that only as much as is] sufficient for food<sup>11</sup> [may be bought]. (How do we know that 'man'<sup>12</sup> means food? — Since it is written, And the king appointed<sup>13</sup> for them a daily portion of the king's food.)<sup>14</sup> But if so,<sup>15</sup> the Lulab also<sup>16</sup> [should not be bought]?<sup>17</sup> —

The Lulab is a product of the sixth year which entered the seventh.<sup>18</sup> But if so, is not the Ethrog also a product of the sixth year which entered the seventh? — In the case of the Ethrog we compute from the time of its gathering.<sup>19</sup> But surely, both R. Gamaliel and R. Eliezer<sup>20</sup> agree that as regards the Sabbatical Year we compute the year of the Ethrog from its time of blossoming, as we have learnt, The Ethrog is like a tree in three respects, and like a vegetable in one. It is like a tree in three respects, as regards the laws of 'Orlah,<sup>21</sup> of the Fourth Year, and of the Seventh Year;<sup>22</sup> and like a vegetable in one respect

- (1) Which assumes the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year which the money previously had.
- (2) That the 'Am ha-arez may be entrusted with a sum sufficient for the purchase of three meals.
- (3) V. Glos. I.e., where the 'Am ha-arez took no measures to protest his field so that the poor may freely come and take of the produce, in which case there is no need to suspect that the

'Am ha-arez intended to keep all the produce for himself.

- (4) Where he took good care to have his field protected, so that there is good reason to suppose that the 'Am ha-arez intends keeping all of it for himself.
- (5) Since the fruit of the Sabbatical Year must be made Hefker for all.
- (6) Var. lec. (cf. sep. edd. of the Mishnah) 'wild Yarbuz'.
- (7) Even from an 'Am ha-arez.
- (8) Sheb. IX, 1; which clearly proves that the produce of an unguarded field may be bought in unlimited quantities, not merely for three meals.
- (9) R. Shesheth.
- (10) The authors of the Mishnah cited.
- (11) 'Man', sc. for three meals of the day.
- (12) Cf. prev. n.
- (13) Wa-yeman of the same rt. as man.
- (14) Dan I, 5.
- (15) That the price of produce of the Sabbatical Year may not be handed over to an 'Am ha-arez if it exceeds the prescribed maximum.
- (16) Since it is subject to the restrictions of the Sabbatical Year.
- (17) From an 'Am ha-arez.
- (18) The year of the palm is reckoned from its blossoming (cf. R.H. 13b) and a palm-branch which is cut in the Sabbatical Year even as late as the fourteenth day of Tishri (the eve of Tabernacles) must, since this month is the first of the year, inevitably have blossomed in the sixth year that preceded it.
- (19) When it is cut from the tree, which, of course, takes place in the seventh year (cf. R.H. 13b, Kid. 3a).
- (20) Who differ in the case of tithe.
- (21) V. Glos.
- (22) I.e., that the year of its growth is the one in which it blossoms.

## Sukkah 40a

in that its tithing is determined by the time of its gathering.<sup>1</sup> So R. Gamaliel. R. Eliezer ruled, The Ethrog is like a tree in all respects?<sup>2</sup> — He<sup>3</sup> holds the same opinion as that Tanna of whom it has been taught: R. Jose stated, Abtolmos gave evidence in the name of five elders that the tithing of the Ethrog depends upon [the time of its] gathering,<sup>4</sup> but our Rabbis voted in Usha<sup>5</sup> and laid down [that this<sup>6</sup> applies] both to tithing and the Sabbatical Year.<sup>7</sup> But who mentioned the Sabbatical Year?<sup>8</sup> —

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

There is a lacuna in the text, and so it should be read: The tithing of the Ethrog depends upon [the time of its] gathering, and its subjection to the laws of the Sabbatical Year depends on [the time of its] blossoming, but our Rabbis voted in Usha and laid down that the Ethrog is dependent on the time of its gathering as regards both tithing and the Sabbatical Year.<sup>9</sup> The reason then for the [permission to purchase a] Lulab<sup>10</sup> is<sup>11</sup> that it is [the product of] the sixth year which entered the seventh, but if it were of the Sabbatical Year it would have been sacred? But why? Is it not mere wood, and wood does not possess the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year, as it has been taught,<sup>12</sup> Leaves of reeds and leaves of the vine which have been heaped up as a hiding-place upon a field, if they were gathered for [animal] food, they possess the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year, but if they were gathered for firewood, they have not the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year?<sup>13</sup> —

There<sup>13</sup> the case is different, since Scripture says, ‘For you for food’<sup>14</sup> thus comparing ‘for you’ to ‘for food’, i.e., that [product is forbidden] the benefit from which comes at the time of its consumption;<sup>15</sup> firewood therefore is excluded since the benefit from it<sup>16</sup> comes after its consumption.<sup>17</sup> But is there not the wood of the pine tree,<sup>18</sup> the benefit from which is derived at the same time as its consumption?<sup>19</sup> —

Raba replied, Wood, as a rule, is used for heating.<sup>20</sup> And the question of whether [the restrictions of the Sabbatical Year apply to] wood that is used for heating<sup>21</sup> is one in dispute between Tannas, as it has been taught: The produce of the Sabbatical Year may not be used<sup>22</sup> either for steeping or for washing. R. Jose ruled, they may be so used.<sup>23</sup> What is the reason of the first Tanna? —

Because Scripture says ‘for food’,<sup>24</sup> [implying] but not for steeping or for washing. What is the reason of R. Jose? —

Because Scripture says, ‘for you’<sup>24</sup> [implying], ‘for all your needs’, even for steeping and for washing. But, according to the first Tanna, is it not written, ‘for you’ — That ‘for you’ is compared with ‘for food’, viz., the benefit from which comes at the same time as its consumption, thus excluding [produce used for] steeping and washing the benefit from which comes after their consumption.<sup>25</sup> But according to R. Jose, is it not written ‘for food’? —

He employs this phrase for the deduction, ‘for food’, but not for an emollient, as it has been taught, ‘for food’, but not for an emollient. You say that ‘for food’ implies but not for an emollient; why not say, ‘[For food]’ but not for washing? When it says, ‘for you’ washing is included, what then can I deduce from the phrase, ‘for food’? ‘For food’, but not for an emollient. But what reason do you see for including washing and excluding an emollient?

(1) If, for instance, it blossomed in the second year of the Septennial Cycle and was gathered in the third, the ‘poor man's tithe’ (due in the latter year) must be given in addition to the first tithe, and not ‘second tithe’ which is due in the second year.

(2) Bik. II, 6; even as regard tithes. How then could it be maintained supra that the Tanna of our Mishnah holds that the year of the Ethrog is the one in which it is gathered?

(3) The Tanna of our Mishnah who forbids the purchase of an Ethrog in the Sabbatical Year.

(4) V. p. 177, n. 16.

(5) One of the seats of the Sanhedrin.

(6) That the determining factor is the year in which it is gathered.

(7) R.H. 15a.

(8) No one, of course; why then the expression, ‘but our Rabbis, etc.’?

(9) V. R.H., Sonc. ed., fol. 15a notes.

(10) In the Sabbatical year.

(11) As has been explained supra 39b.

(12) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, ‘we learned’.

(13) B.K. 101b.

(14) Lev. XXV, 6.

(15) When a fruit, for instance, is eaten, or an oil is used in a lamp.

(16) Baking on it, for instance.



# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(17) I.e., when it is already turned into coals. A Lulab, however, whose main use is for sweeping a floor is used up or consumed at the same time that the benefit is derived from it.

(18) Used for torches.

(19) Why then should not the laws of the Sabbatical Year apply to it where it was gathered for lighting purposes?

(20) So that the benefit cannot be derived until it is consumed. Hence its exemption from the laws of the Sabbatical Year even where it was expressly gathered for lighting.

(21) So Rashi a.l. Cf., however, Tosaf. a.l. and Rashi B.K. 102a.

(22) Lit., 'handed over'.

(23) B.K. 102a.

(24) Lev. XXV, 6.

(25) If flax, for instance, is steeped in wine of the Sabbatical Year in the process of its preparations, the wine is already spoilt by the time the flax is ready for use.

## Sukkah 40b

I include washing since<sup>1</sup> it is a requirement common to all men and exclude an emollient since it is not common to all men.<sup>2</sup> Who is the author of that [statement] which our Rabbis taught: 'For food' implies but not for an emollient, 'for food', but not for perfume, 'for food' but not for an emetic?—

In agreement with whom is this statement? It is in agreement with R. Jose;<sup>3</sup> for were it [to be suggested, with] the Rabbis,<sup>4</sup> [it could be retorted,] surely there is also steeping and washing [to be excluded].<sup>5</sup> R. Eleazar ruled, The produce of the Sabbatical Year can be redeemed<sup>6</sup> only by way of sale,<sup>7</sup> while R. Johanan ruled, Either by way of sale or by way of exchange.<sup>8</sup> What is the reason of R. Eleazar? —

Since it is written, In this year of jubilee ye shall return, etc.<sup>9</sup> and there follows immediately the verse, And if thou sell aught to thy neighbor,<sup>10</sup> [which implies,]<sup>11</sup> only by way of sale,<sup>12</sup> but not by way of exchange. And what is the reason of R. Johanan? —

Since it is written, For it is a jubilee, it shall be holy;<sup>13</sup> just as sacred objects can be redeemed either by way of sale or by way of exchange, so the produce of the Sabbatical Year can be redeemed either by way of sale or by way of exchange. But what does R. Johanan do with the verse, 'And if thou sell aught unto thy neighbor'?<sup>14</sup> —

He requires it in accordance with the statement of R. Jose b. Hanina, as it has been taught,<sup>15</sup> R. Jose b. Hanina observed, Come and see how serious is [even] the dust<sup>16</sup> of the Sabbatical Year,<sup>17</sup> etc. For if a man merely trades with the produce of the Sabbatical Year, the result is that he will eventually have to sell his movables and his tools, as it is said, 'In this year of jubilee ye shall return, each man to his possession'<sup>18</sup> and there immediately follows the verse, 'And if thou sell aught unto thy neighbor, etc.'<sup>19</sup> What, however, does R. Eleazar do with the verse of R. Johanan? —

He needs it in accordance with what has been taught, 'For it is a jubilee, it shall be holy unto you';<sup>20</sup> just as with holy objects the money [for which it is redeemed] assumes the same sanctity,<sup>21</sup> so with the products of the Sabbatical Year, the money [for which it is redeemed] assumes the same sanctity.

It has been taught in agreement with R. Eleazar, and it has also been taught in agreement with R. Johanan.

It has been taught in agreement with R. Eleazar: [In the case of the produce of] the Sabbatical Year the money [for which it is exchanged] assumes the same sanctity [as the produce itself], for it is said, 'For it is a jubilee it shall be holy unto you';<sup>20</sup> just as with holy objects the money [for which it is redeemed assumes] the sanctity [of the holy object], and becomes forbidden, so with the produce of the Sabbatical Year, the money [for which it is redeemed] assumes the same sanctity [as the produce] and becomes

# SUCCAḤ – 29b-56b

forbidden. [But] in case [you would say] that just as, with holy objects, the money [for which it is redeemed] assumes its sanctity and [the holy object itself] becomes profaned, so also with the produce of the Sabbatical Year, the money for which it is redeemed assumes its sanctity and the [produce itself] becomes profaned Scripture explicitly says, ‘it shall be’<sup>20</sup> i.e., it remains in its original consecrated state. How so? If with the produce of the Sabbatical Year one purchased meat, both the meat<sup>22</sup> and the produce<sup>23</sup> must be removed<sup>24</sup> during the Sabbatical Year. If, however, one purchased with the meat fish, the meat<sup>25</sup> emerges [from the sanctity of the produce of the Sabbatical Year], and the fish assumes it. If one purchased with the fish wine, the fish emerges [from the sanctity of the produce of the Sabbatical Year], and the wine assumes it. If one purchased with the wine oil, the wine emerges [from Its state of sanctity] and the oil assumes it. How does this come about? The last [object for which the previous one is redeemed] assumes [the sanctity] of the Sabbatical Year,<sup>26</sup> but the produce itself<sup>27</sup> remains under restriction.<sup>28</sup> Now since the term ‘purchased’ repeatedly is used, it is evident that only by way of sale [does it become redeemed], but not by way of exchange.<sup>29</sup>

It was taught in agreement with R. Johanan: Both the produce of the Sabbatical Year and of the Second Tithe may be redeemed<sup>30</sup> with cattle, beast or fowl, whether live or slaughtered. These are the words of R. Meir, while the Sages ruled, With slaughtered [animals and fowls] they may be redeemed,<sup>30</sup> but not with live ones, this being a preventive measure against one's possible rearing of flocks<sup>31</sup> from them.<sup>32</sup>

Raba said, The dispute<sup>33</sup> applies only

- (1) Like the eating of ‘food’.
- (2) Thus it has been shown that the first Tanna who excludes steeping and washing, on the

ground that the produce is already consumed by the time the benefit is derived from it, excludes also for the same reason, wood that is used for heating, while R. Jose who does not exclude steeping and washing does not exclude wood either.

(3) Who excludes only such benefit as is not common to all.

(4) Sc. the first Tanna.

(5) V. p. 179, n. 10.

(6) Lit., ‘rendered profane’; whereby that for which it is exchanged receives the sanctity which the produce of the Sabbatical Year had previously, and the produce itself becomes redeemed.

(7) I.e., only if it is sold to a second party, not by exchanging the one for the other while the owner retains the produce for himself as in the case of holy things.

(8) By declaring ‘This produce is exchange for this money’.

(9) Lev. XXV, 13. The laws of the Jubilee are also applicable to the Sabbatical Year.

(10) Ibid. 14.

(11) Since the two verses are in juxtaposition.

(12) May the produce of the Sabbatical Year be redeemed.

(13) Ibid. 12.

(14) Ibid. 14.

(15) ‘Ar. 30b.

(16) Sc. not only the actual prohibition itself but even secondary prohibitions.

(17) V. supra n. 7.

(18) V. p. 180, n. 7.

(19) Lev. XXV, 14.

(20) Ibid. 12.

(21) Lit., ‘takes hold of the money thereof’. While the objects completely lose their sanctity.

(22) Which has assumed sanctity — i.e., the character of the Sabbatical Year produce.

(23) Which remained in its original state.

(24) V. Sheb. Ch. VII.

(25) Whose sanctity was only an acquired one.

(26) While the previous object loses its sanctity.

(27) That actually grew in the Sabbatical Year.

(28) Kid. 58a.

(29) This Baraita thus agrees with R. Eleazar.

(30) Lit., ‘rendered profane’, the general term used for redeeming sacred objects implying ‘exchange’, in agreement with R. Johanan.

(31) A generic term for animals, beasts and fowls.

(32) And by thus retaining them would transgress either the precept of removing the tithe by the end of the third year of the Septennial Cycle (v. Deut. XXVI, 12ff) or the prohibition against trading with the produce of the Sabbatical Year.

(33) Between R. Meir and the Sages.

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

## Sukkah 41a

to male [animals and birds],<sup>1</sup> but with regard to female ones, all agree that they may be redeemed with slaughtered ones, but not with live ones, since a preventive measure has been enacted against one's possible rearing of flocks from them.

R. Ashi said, The dispute<sup>2</sup> concerns only the original produce itself,<sup>3</sup> but with regard to secondary produce,<sup>4</sup> both agree that [it can be redeemed] either by way of sale, or by way of exchange: and the reason that the term 'purchased' was continually repeated<sup>5</sup> is that since in the first clause the term 'purchased' was used it was used in the latter clause also.<sup>6</sup>

Rabina raised an objection against R. Ashi, [It has been taught]: If a man has a Sela' of [the proceeds of the produce of] the Sabbatical Year,<sup>7</sup> and wishes to purchase therewith a shirt,<sup>8</sup> how should he proceed?<sup>9</sup> Let him go to his regular shopkeeper<sup>10</sup> and say to him, 'Give me a Sela' worth of fruit' and give it to him.<sup>11</sup> Then he tells him, 'Behold this fruit<sup>12</sup> is given to you as a gift',<sup>13</sup> and [the shopkeeper] answers him, 'And here is a gift for you of a Sela''<sup>14</sup> And the latter may purchase with it whatsoever he desires.<sup>15</sup> Now here, surely, the Sela' is a secondary produce,<sup>16</sup> and yet it teaches, does it not, [that it may be redeemed only] by way of sale, and not by way of exchange?<sup>17</sup> —

Rather, said R. Ashi, the dispute [of R. Eleazar and R. Johanan] centers round the secondary produce, but with regard to the primary produce all agree that [it may be redeemed] only by way of sale, and not by way of exchange; and as to what has been stated,<sup>18</sup> 'Both the produce of the Sabbatical Year and of the Second Tithe [may be redeemed by exchange]',<sup>19</sup> what is meant by 'the produce of the Sabbatical Year' is the money for which the produce is

exchanged. For if you will not say so, then 'tithe' also must mean actual tithe,<sup>20</sup> surely it is written, Thou shalt bind the money in thy hand?<sup>21</sup> Consequently it must mean the money for which tithe [was exchanged],<sup>22</sup> and so here also it means the money for which the produce of the Sabbatical Year [is exchanged].

*MISHNAH.* FORMERLY<sup>23</sup> THE LULAB WAS TAKEN FOR SEVEN DAYS IN THE TEMPLE, AND IN THE PROVINCES<sup>24</sup> FOR ONE DAY ONLY. WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED, R. JOHANAN R. ZAKKAI INSTITUTED THAT THE LULAB SHOULD BE TAKEN IN THE PROVINCES FOR SEVEN DAYS IN MEMORY OF THE TEMPLE, [AND HE ALSO INSTITUTED] THAT ON THE WHOLE OF THE DAY OF WAVING<sup>25</sup> IT SHALL BE FORBIDDEN [TO EAT THE NEW PRODUCE OF THE YEAR].<sup>26</sup>

*GEMARA.* Whence do we know that we must perform [ceremonies] in memory of the Temple? — R. Johanan replied, Since Scripture says, For I will restore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds, saith the Lord, Because they have called thee an outcast. She is Zion, there is none that seeketh for her.<sup>27</sup> 'There is none that seeketh for her', implies that she should be sought.<sup>28</sup>

AND THAT ON THE WHOLE OF THE DAY OF WAVING. What is the reason? — The Temple may be rebuilt speedily, and people<sup>29</sup> would say, 'Did we not eat [the new corn] last year from the time that day dawned in the East? Let us now also eat it [from the same time]' and they would be unaware of the fact that in the previous year, when there was no Temple, once day dawned in the East it was permitted [to eat of the new corn], but now that the Temple is rebuilt, it is only the [waving of the] 'Omer which [commences] the permission.<sup>30</sup> But when [does this assume the Temple to be] rebuilt? If you will say that it is rebuilt on the sixteenth [of Nisan],

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

then obviously it is permitted to eat from the time that day dawned in the East?<sup>31</sup> If, however, it is rebuilt on the fifteenth<sup>32</sup> why should it not be permitted after midday, for surely we have learnt, Those that lived at a distance<sup>33</sup> were permitted [to eat of the new corn] from midday<sup>34</sup> onwards, because [they knew that] the Beth din would not be negligent in the matter?<sup>35</sup> —

This<sup>36</sup> was necessary [only in case] it is rebuilt at night,<sup>37</sup> or [on the fifteenth] close to sunset.<sup>38</sup> R.<sup>39</sup> Nahman b. Isaac replied, R. Johanan b. Zakkai instituted this in accordance with a principle of R. Judah<sup>40</sup> who holds that Pentateuchally all that day<sup>41</sup> is forbidden,<sup>42</sup> since it is written,

- (1) Who are not usually kept for breeding purposes. Only in this case does R. Meir not uphold the preventive measure of the Sages.
- (2) Between R. Eleazar and R. Johanan.
- (3) That actually grew in the Sabbatical Year.
- (4) The produce for which the original produce is exchanged.
- (5) In the Baraita (supra 40b) cited in support of R. Eleazar.
- (6) Though actually one could exchange it as well.
- (7) Which must be spent in the same year.
- (8) Which would probably last until the following year.
- (9) In order to comply with the law which permits it to be spent for use in the same year only.
- (10) lit., 'with whom he is familiar'. Who, on account of their acquaintance would be willing to oblige him.
- (11) The Sela' thus loses all its sanctity which passes over to the fruit.
- (12) Which is now sacred.
- (13) And the shopkeeper eats during the Sabbatical Year.
- (14) Which now possesses no sanctity.
- (15) The fruit becomes sacred and being given as a gift, can be eaten by the shopkeeper. The money has become redeemed in the process of exchange and can, therefore, be used to purchase anything.
- (16) The Sela', being money received from the sale of the original produce is obviously a 'secondary produce'.
- (17) Had the latter way been permitted there would have been no need to go to a shopkeeper. It would have sufficed for the man to redeem the Sela' with any produce he has in his own

house. How then could R. Ashi maintain that secondary produce may be redeemed by way of exchange?

- (18) Cited supra 40b in support of R. Johanan.
- (19) Which would prove that the Sabbatical produce itself may be redeemed by way of exchange.
- (20) I.e., that it may be exchanged for cattle, beast or fowl.
- (21) Deut. XIV, 25; which proves that the exchange can only be made for money.
- (22) It is the money obtained from the sale of the tithe which is mentioned, not the tithe itself.
- (23) In Temple times. This Mishnah is repeated in R.H. IV, 3.
- (24) Including Jerusalem (Rashi).
- (25) The sixteenth of Nisan, the Second Day of Passover, when the 'Omer was first waved. (Cf. Lev. XXIII, 11).
- (26) When the Temple stood, the new corn could be eaten immediately after the waving, but after the destruction of the Temple it was Pentateuchally permitted from the early morning (cf. Men. 68a). R. Johanan b. Zakkai, however, forbade it the whole day.
- (27) Jer. XXX, 17.
- (28) I.e., that ceremonies in its memory should be performed.
- (29) Who before its rebuilding were eating the new produce from the morning of the sixteenth of Nisan.
- (30) The distinction depends upon the apparent contradiction in Lev. XXIII, 14 which says, Until this self-same day until ye have brought the offering, the first part of which permits it the moment day dawns, the second when the offering has been brought. V. Men. 68a.
- (31) Since in the morning there was as yet no Temple.
- (32) Or before.
- (33) From Jerusalem, and were, therefore, unaware when the court ordained the offering of the 'Omer.
- (34) Of the sixteenth.
- (35) Men. X, 5; and would certainly effect it before midday.
- (36) The institution of R. Johanan b. Zakkai.
- (37) That belonged to the sixteenth of Nisan.
- (38) So that in either case there would be no time to prepare the 'Omer, which necessitates great preparation, before midday on the sixteenth. On the question how the Temple could be rebuilt on the fifteenth day, being a Festival day. v. Rashi and Tosaf.
- (39) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'said R.'.
- (40) R. Judah lived two generations later than R. Johanan b. Zakkai, but the meaning is that they were both of the same opinion.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(41) Of the sixteenth of Nisan, the Day of Waving.

(42) To eat of the new corn.

## Sukkah 41b

Until this self-same day,<sup>1</sup> [which means] until the very day itself, and he is of the opinion that the expression ‘until’ is meant to include [the terminus in the prohibition].<sup>2</sup> But does he<sup>3</sup> hold a similar opinion?<sup>4</sup> Does he not in fact disagree with him, as we have learnt,<sup>5</sup> When the Temple was destroyed, R. Johanan b. Zakkai instituted that on the whole of the Day of the Waving it should be forbidden [to eat of the new corn]. Said R. Judah to him, But<sup>6</sup> is it not forbidden Pentateuchally, since it is written, ‘Until the self-same day’<sup>7</sup> [which means] until the very day itself?<sup>8</sup> —

It is R. Judah who was under a misapprehension, He thought that [R. Johanan b. Zakkai] meant that it<sup>9</sup> was forbidden as a Rabbinical prohibition, but it is not so. He meant it as a Pentateuchal prohibition. But does it not say, ‘He instituted’?<sup>10</sup> — What is meant by ‘he instituted’ is that he expounded (the Pentateuchal verse)<sup>11</sup> and instituted the law accordingly.

**MISHNAH.** IF THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL<sup>12</sup> FALLS ON A SABBATH, ALL THE PEOPLE BRING THEIR LULABS TO THE SYNAGOGUE [ON THE PREVIOUS DAY]. ON THE MORROW THEY ARISE EARLY [AND COME TO THE SYNAGOGUE] AND EACH ONE RECOGNIZES HIS OWN [LULAB] AND TAKES IT, SINCE THE SAGES LAID DOWN THAT NO ONE CAN FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL WITH THE LULAB OF HIS FELLOW. BUT ON THE OTHER DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL A MAN MAY FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION WITH THE LULAB OF HIS FELLOW. R. JOSE RULED, IF THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL FELL ON THE SABBATH, AND A MAN FORGOT AND CARRIED OUT HIS LULAB

INTO A PUBLIC DOMAIN, HE IS NOT CULPABLE, SINCE HE BROUGHT IT OUT WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE [OF A RELIGIOUS ACT].<sup>13</sup>

**GEMARA.** Whence do we know this?<sup>14</sup> — From what our Rabbis have taught, ‘And ye shall take’<sup>15</sup> [implies] that there should be a ‘taking’ with the hand of each individual, ‘to you,’ implies that it should be yours, excluding a borrowed or a stolen [Lulab]. From this verse the Sages deduced that no one can fulfill his obligation on the first day of the Festival with the Lulab of his fellow, unless the latter gave it to him as a gift. And it once happened that when R. Gamaliel, R. Joshua, R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah and R. Akiba were traveling on a ship<sup>16</sup> and R. Gamaliel alone had a Lulab which he had bought for one thousand Zuz, R. Gamaliel took it and fulfilled his obligation with it; then he gave it as a gift to R. Joshua who took it, fulfilled his obligation with it and gave it as a gift to R. Eleazar b. ‘Azariah who took it, fulfilled his obligation with it, and gave it as a gift to R. Akiba who took it, fulfilled his obligation with it and then returned it to R. Gamaliel. Why does he need mention that he<sup>17</sup> returned it?<sup>18</sup> —

He teaches us something incidentally viz., that a gift made on condition that it be returned constitutes a valid gift; as also follows from what Raba said: [If a man say to his fellow], ‘Here is an Ethrog [as a gift] on condition that you return it to me’, and the latter took it and fulfilled his obligation with it, if he returned it, he is regarded as having fulfilled his obligation,<sup>19</sup> but if he did not return it, he is regarded as not having fulfilled his obligation.<sup>20</sup> For what purpose need he mention that [R. Gamaliel] had bought it for one thousand Zuz? —

In order to let you know how precious to them was the opportunity of fulfilling a religious duty. Mar b. Amemar said to R. Ashi, My father used to recite his prayers [while holding the Lulab in his hand].<sup>21</sup> It

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

was objected: A man should not hold his Tefillin in his hand or a Scroll of the Law in his bosom while reciting his prayers,<sup>22</sup> nor [while wearing his Tefillin] should he let water, or doze or sleep.<sup>23</sup> And in connection with this Samuel said, The same<sup>24</sup> applies to a knife,<sup>25</sup> a dish,<sup>26</sup> a loaf of bread<sup>27</sup> and money?<sup>28</sup> —

In the latter cases he is not performing a religious duty<sup>29</sup> and, therefore, would worry over them<sup>30</sup> but in the former one<sup>31</sup> he is fulfilling a religious duty<sup>32</sup> and, therefore, he would not worry over it.<sup>33</sup> It has been taught, R. Eleazar b. Zadok stated, This was the custom of the men<sup>34</sup> of Jerusalem. When a man left his house he carried his Lulab in his hand; when he went to the synagogue his Lulab was in his hand, when he read the Shema'<sup>35</sup> and his prayers<sup>36</sup> his Lulab was still in his hand, but when he read in the Law or<sup>37</sup> recited the priestly benediction<sup>38</sup> he would lay it on the ground.<sup>39</sup> If he went to visit the sick or to comfort mourners, he would go with his Lulab in his hand, but when he entered the House of Study, he would send his Lulab by the hand of his son, his slave or his messenger.<sup>40</sup> What does this<sup>41</sup> teach us? — It serves to inform you how zealous they were in the performance of religious duties.

**R. JOSE RULED, [IF THE FIRST DAY OF] THE FESTIVAL, etc.** Abaye stated,

- (1) Lev. XXIII, 14.
- (2) Sc. 'until the day' means that even on the day itself it is also forbidden.
- (3) R. Judah.
- (4) To that of R. Johanan b. Zakkai.
- (5) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'for it was taught'.
- (6) Why institute it?
- (7) Lev. XXIII, 14.
- (8) Men. 68a, which shows that R. Judah and R. Johanan b. Zakkai differ.
- (9) The new corn on the sixteenth day.
- (10) An expression which implies a Rabbinical prohibition only.
- (11) Explaining that 'until' includes also the terminus.
- (12) Of Tabernacles.

(13) He was so intent on the performance of the act that he inadvertently overlooked the fact that the day was the Sabbath on which such carrying is forbidden.

(14) That one cannot fulfill one's obligation on the first day with someone else's Lulab.

(15) Lev. XXIII, 40.

(16) On the Festival of Sukkoth. Probably on their way to Rome in the year 95 B.C. [V. Finkelstein L., Akiba, p. 137.]

(17) R. Akiba.

(18) To R. Gamaliel, who had already fulfilled his duty at the very beginning.

(19) Because the condition on which the gift was dependent was duly carried out.

(20) Since the gift was dependent upon the condition of his returning it, which was not complied with.

(21) The fulfillment of the duty of Lulab was so dear to him that he did not wish to part with it even during prayer.

(22) Since he might be so anxious not to drop the Tefillin or the scroll that he would not concentrate on his prayers.

(23) In case he might drop them (cf. supra 26a).

(24) That they must not be held in one's hand during prayers.

(25) The man's anxiety not to let it drop upon his foot prevents him from concentration on his prayer.

(26) That was full (cf. prev. n. mut. mut.).

(27) The falling of which to the ground would render it objectionable.

(28) Ber. 23b; which a man is anxious not to drop and scatter (cf. supra n. 4 mut. mut.).

(29) In holding the objects mentioned.

(30) Being a burden to him they disturb his mind and interfere with his prayers.

(31) Lulab.

(32) In holding it.

(33) His prayers, therefore, would not be disturbed.

(34) Cf. supra p. 164, n. 9.

(35) Sc. Deut. VI, 4-9, XI, 13-21 and Num. XV, 37-41 (cf. P.B. pp. 40-42).

(36) The 'Amidah or the Eighteen Benedictions (cf. P.B. pp. 44-54).

(37) Being a priest.

(38) 'The Lord bless thee, etc.' (cf. P.B. p. 53).

(39) He had to use his hands to roll up the Scroll of the Law and he had to raise his outspread hands when reciting the priestly benediction.

(40) Tosef. Sukkah II. Lest his interest in his studies should cause him to forget its existence and to drop it from his hands.

(41) The record of the custom of the men of Jerusalem.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

## Sukkah 42a

They taught [that he is not culpable] only when he had not yet fulfilled his obligation,<sup>1</sup> but if he had fulfilled his obligation,<sup>1</sup> he is guilty of a transgression.<sup>2</sup> But has he not fulfilled his obligation<sup>3</sup> the moment he lifted it up?<sup>4</sup> —

Abaye answered, [This is a case] where he held it upside down.<sup>5</sup> Raba replied, You may even say that he did not hold it upside down,<sup>6</sup> but here we are dealing with a case where he carried it out in a vessel. But is it not Raba himself who laid down that taking by means of something else is regarded as a valid taking?<sup>7</sup> — That applies only [where the taking with something else is done] as a mark of respect, but not [if it is done] in a disrespectful manner.<sup>8</sup>

R. Huna stated, R. Jose used to say, A fowl [offered as] a burnt-offering<sup>9</sup> that was found<sup>10</sup> among other fowls<sup>11</sup> and [the priest] thought that it was a fowl of a sin-offering, and ate it, he is not culpable.<sup>12</sup> What, however, does he<sup>13</sup> teach us by this ruling? Is it that if a man errs in connection with a matter of religious duty he is exempt? But this is, is it not, exactly the same [as the one in our Mishnah]?<sup>14</sup> —

It might have been assumed that only there<sup>15</sup> is the man not culpable when he errs in connection with a matter of religious duty, because [by his very mistake] he performs a religious duty,<sup>16</sup> but here,<sup>17</sup> where, by erring in connection with a matter of religious duty he does not perform another religious duty,<sup>18</sup> might have said that he is culpable, therefore he<sup>19</sup> informs us [that even here he is not culpable]. An objection was raised: R. Jose ruled, If a man slaughters on the Sabbath the daily offering which has not been properly examined,<sup>20</sup> he is liable to bring a sin-offering<sup>21</sup> and another daily offering must be offered!<sup>22</sup> —

The other answered him, That case lies in a different category,<sup>23</sup> for concerning it it has been stated: R. Samuel b. Hattai citing R. Hamnuna Saba<sup>24</sup> who cited it in the name of R. Isaac b. Ashian who had it from R. Huna who cited Rab, explained, This is a case, for instance, where the daily offering was brought from a chamber that contained animals which had not been examined.<sup>25</sup>

*MISHNAH.* A WOMAN MAY TAKE [THE LULAB] FROM THE HAND OF HER SON OR FROM THE HAND OF HER HUSBAND AND PUT IT BACK IN WATER<sup>26</sup> ON THE SABBATH.<sup>27</sup> R. JUDAH RULED, ON THE SABBATH IT MAY BE PUT BACK [INTO THE WATER IN WHICH IT WAS PREVIOUSLY KEPT],<sup>28</sup> ON A FESTIVAL DAY<sup>29</sup> [WATER] MAY BE ADDED,<sup>30</sup> AND ON THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS [OF THE FESTIVAL THE WATER] MAY ALSO BE CHANGED. A MINOR<sup>31</sup> WHO KNOWS HOW TO SHAKE [THE LULAB] IS SUBJECT TO THE OBLIGATION OF LULAB.

*GEMARA.* Is not this<sup>32</sup> obvious? — I might have said that, since a woman does not come under the obligation [of Lulab] she may not take it,<sup>33</sup> therefore he informs us [that she may].<sup>34</sup>

A MINOR WHO KNOWS HOW TO SHAKE THE [LULAB]. Our Rabbis taught, A minor who knows how to shake [the Lulab] is<sup>35</sup> subject to the obligation of the Lulab;<sup>36</sup> [if he knows how] to wrap himself [with the Tallith]<sup>37</sup> he is subject to the obligation of Zizith;<sup>38</sup> [if he knows how] to look after Tefillin, his father must acquire Tefillin for him; if he is able to speak, his father must teach him Torah and the reading of the Shema'. What [in this context] could be meant by Torah? —

R. Hamnuna replied, [The Scriptural verse] Moses commanded us a Law, an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob.<sup>39</sup> What [in this context] is meant by the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Shema'? — The first verse.<sup>40</sup> If [the minor] knows how to take care of his body<sup>41</sup> we may eat food that has been prepared in ritual purity though his body [touched it]; if he knows how to take care of hands,<sup>42</sup> we may eat food that has been prepared in ritual purity even though his hands [touched it]. If he knows how to answer [questions on whether he touched any ritual uncleanness], a doubtful case on his part<sup>43</sup> that occurs in a private domain is regarded as unclean, but if in a public domain as clean.<sup>44</sup> [If he<sup>45</sup> knows how] to spread out his hands [in priestly benediction]<sup>46</sup> Terumah<sup>37</sup> may be shared out to him in the threshing-floors.<sup>47</sup>

- (1) Before he left his house.
- (2) Since at the time he left his house he could not have been under the influence of a religious act.
- (3) Of 'taking' the Lulab.
- (4) Of course he did. How then is it possible ever to leave one's house with a Lulab in hand without having ipso facto fulfilled the prescribed duty?
- (5) The obligation is not fulfilled unless it is held as it grows naturally (cf. infra 45b).
- (6) The reason is explained presently.
- (7) Supra 37a.
- (8) If one takes it with the scarf one wears out of respect, it is valid but if one carries it out in a vessel, thus showing lack of respect, it is not valid.
- (9) The burnt-offering was forbidden to be eaten, since all of it had to be consumed on the altar.
- (10) At the south western side of the altar where, in addition to burnt-offerings of fowls, sin-offerings of fowls were also sometimes offered.
- (11) Lit., 'wings'.
- (12) Sc. is exempt from a trespass-offering which the eating of it would otherwise have entailed. Since the eating of a sin-offering is a religious duty, no offence is committed by the man who, intending to do a good deed, has mistakenly eaten the wrong bird.
- (13) R. Huna.
- (14) When R. Jose informs us that if one errs in connection with a matter of religious duty he is not culpable. Why then should R. Huna merely repeat a ruling of our Mishnah?
- (15) In our Mishnah.
- (16) That of taking the Lulab.
- (17) In R. Huna's ruling.

- (18) Since the fowl is a burnt-offering no religious duty is performed in eating it.
- (19) R. Huna.
- (20) To ascertain whether it was free from blemishes.
- (21) Because a daily offering that has not been previously examined is invalid, and by slaughtering it on the Sabbath one is guilty of doing forbidden work.
- (22) Now since R. Jose holds the man liable to bring a sin-offering it follows that if one errs in connection with a matter of religious duty without performing one, he is culpable. An objection against R. Huna.
- (23) Lit., 'outside that (case)'.
- (24) The Elder.
- (25) The man had no right at all to take an animal from an unexamined supply and his act, therefore, is not a mistake committed when under the anxiety of performing a religious duty, but almost a willful transgression.
- (26) To prevent it from withering.
- (27) And she is not guilty of moving an object that is useless to her.
- (28) But no other water may be added. Much less may the water be changed.
- (29) Which is subject to lesser restrictions than the Sabbath.
- (30) But not changed.
- (31) Under the age of thirteen years and one day.
- (32) That A WOMAN MAY TAKE THE LULAB, etc.
- (33) Since she is carrying on the festival an object that is useless to her.
- (34) Since the Lulab is suitable for the man it has the status of a 'vessel' which may be moved by everybody.
- (35) In Rabbinic law.
- (36) In this and all the instances that follow, the purpose is to train the child in the observance of precepts.
- (37) V. Glos.
- (38) Cf. Num. XV, 37.
- (39) Deut. XXXIII, 4.
- (40) Deut. VI, 4, the first verse of the passage.
- (41) Though not of his hands, i.e., he is careful enough not to touch any ritual uncleanness with his body though he might allow his hands to touch a minor uncleanness.
- (42) Cf. prev. n. mut. mut.
- (43) Sc. if he answer that he is in doubt.
- (44) Cf. Sot. 28a. Any doubtful case of uncleanness is regarded as clean if it is in a public domain and unclean if in a private one.
- (45) Being a priest.
- (46) I.e., he actually performs the precept in public (Rashi). Num. VI, 24ff. Cf. P.B. p. 53.



# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

(47) Where the sharing of the Terumah to the priests took place publicly. As such a boy may obviously be relied upon (cf. Meg. 24a) to preserve the Terumah in its Levitical purity, it may be given to him even in public. (V. Tosaf). If he is unable to 'spread his hands' he cannot be assumed to know how to take proper care of Terumah and, therefore, only those who know him personally to be able to do it may privately send Terumah to his house (cf. Yeb. 99b).

## Sukkah 42b

If he knows how to slaughter [animals ritually]<sup>1</sup> we may eat from [the meat of animals] which he has slaughtered. R. Huna explained: This applies only where an adult was standing by his side [when he performed the act].<sup>2</sup> If [a child] is able to eat an olive size of [bread made of] corn,<sup>3</sup> one<sup>4</sup> must remove oneself a distance of at least four cubits from his excrement or water.<sup>5</sup> R. Hisda explained: This applies only where the child is able to consume it<sup>6</sup> in the time [which it takes an ordinary adult] to eat half a loaf.<sup>7</sup> (R. Hiyya the son of R. Yeba observed, But in the case of an adult [the laws applies] even if he cannot eat it<sup>6</sup> in the time [which it takes a normal person] to eat half a loaf, since it is written, He that increaseth knowledge<sup>9</sup> increaseth sorrow.)<sup>10</sup> If [a child] can eat an olive of roast meat, the Paschal lamb may be slaughtered on his behalf,<sup>11</sup> as it is said, According to the eating of every man.<sup>12</sup> R. Judah ruled, [This<sup>13</sup> is not allowed] until he is able to pick out an eatable. In what manner? — If he is given a splinter, he throws it away; if he is given a nut, he eats it.

## CHAPTER IV

**MISHNAH.** [THE CEREMONIALS OF] THE LULAB AND THE WILLOW<sup>14</sup> [CONTINUED FOR] SIX [DAYS] OR<sup>15</sup> SEVEN; THE [RECITAL OF THE WHOLE] HALLEL<sup>16</sup> AND THE REJOICING<sup>17</sup> [CONTINUED FOR] EIGHT [DAYS]; [THE DWELLING IN A SUKKAH AND THE WATER LIBATION]<sup>18</sup> SEVEN [DAYS]; THE FLUTE PLAYING<sup>19</sup>

FIVE<sup>20</sup> OR SIX [DAYS].<sup>21</sup> '[THE CEREMONIALS OF] THE LULAB... SEVEN'. HOW IS THIS? IF THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL FELL ON A SABBATH, THE LULAB [IS CARRIED FOR] SEVEN DAYS; BUT [IF IT FELL] ON ANY OTHER DAY, [IT IS CARRIED ONLY] FOR SIX.<sup>22</sup> 'THE WILLOW... SEVEN DAYS'. HOW IS THIS? IF THE SEVENTH DAY OF [THE CEREMONIALS OF] THE WILLOW FELL ON SABBATH, [THEY LAST] SEVEN DAYS; IF IT FELL ON ANY OTHER DAY, [THEY LAST ONLY] SIX.<sup>23</sup> HOW WAS [THE CEREMONIAL OF] THE LULAB CARRIED OUT?<sup>24</sup> IF THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL FELL ON A SABBATH, THEY BROUGHT THEIR LULABS TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT, AND THE ATTENDANTS RECEIVED THEM AND ARRANGED THEM IN ORDER UPON THE PORTICO,<sup>25</sup> WHILE THE ELDERS<sup>26</sup> LAID THEIRS IN A CHAMBER.<sup>27</sup> AND THE PEOPLE WERE INSTRUCTED TO SAY, 'WHOSOEVER GETS MY LULAB IN HIS HAND, LET IT BE HIS AS A GIFT'.<sup>28</sup> ON THE MORROW THEY AROSE BETIMES, AND CAME [TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT] AND THE ATTENDANTS THREW DOWN [THEIR LULABS] BEFORE THEM, AND THEY SNATCHED AT THEM, AND SO THEY USED TO COME TO BLOWS WITH ONE ANOTHER. WHEN THE BETH DIN, HOWEVER, SAW THAT THEY REACHED A STATE OF DANGER, THEY INSTITUTED THAT EACH MAN SHOULD TAKE [HIS LULAB] IN HIS OWN HOME.

**GEMARA.** But why [should it be forbidden to carry the Lulab on the Sabbath]?<sup>29</sup> It<sup>30</sup> involves only a mere movement, why then<sup>31</sup> should it not override the Sabbath?<sup>32</sup> — Rabbah answered, It<sup>33</sup> is a restrictive measure, lest a man take [the Lulab] in his hand and go to an expert in order to learn [the rites connected with it]

(1) Though he is not well-versed in the various laws associated with it (Rashi).

(2) And the adult testifies that all the ritual laws associated with it were duly observed.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (3) Of any of the following five species: Wheat, barley, spelt, oats and rye.
- (4) Who desires to read his prayers or any sacred matter.
- (5) Since they emit an offensive odor.
- (6) The olive size of bread.
- (7) Sc. an amount of bread that suffices for two ordinary meals. A whole loaf suffices for four meals (cf. 'Er. 82b). If it takes him a longer time he is in the same legal position as one who eats the size of half an olive on one day and the size of another half on the following day, in which case the two are not combined to form the prescribed minimum.
- (8) To remove oneself, etc.
- (9) Sc. the adult, as compared with the child.
- (10) Eccl. I, 18. 'Sorroa is taken as a euphemism. The older a man is, the more offensive his excrement.
- (11) Sc. he may be included in a party that joined together to participate in the lamb.
- (12) Ex. XII, 4; emphasis on 'eating'.
- (13) The inclusion of a child in a party for participation in the Paschal lamb.
- (14) The willow branch was carried round the Altar in the Temple (cf. infra 45a).
- (15) When they superseded the Sabbath v. infra.
- (16) Ps. CXIII-CXVIII.
- (17) The consumption of peace-offerings (cf. Deut. XVI, 14 and Pes. 109a).
- (18) After the offering of the regular daily morning offering during the Festival (cf. Yoma 26b).
- (19) In connection with the water drawing.
- (20) If a Sabbath occurred during the middle of the Festival.
- (21) If the first day happened to be a Sabbath. Since the flute may not be played on the Sabbath and on the first and last day of the Festival, three days have to be deducted from the eight in the former case (cf. prev. n.) and only two (the first and the last) in the latter case where Sabbath coincides with the first and last Festival days. Each of the items mentioned in the Mishnah is dealt with at length in the subsequent Mishnahs, where it is fully explained.
- (22) The Lulab may be carried on Sabbath on the first day only. If the first day was not Sabbath, one of the succeeding days was, and on this Sabbath it was not permitted to be carried.
- (23) The Gemara later explains the importance of the seventh day.
- (24) When during Temple times the first day fell on a Sabbath.
- (25) The Temple Mount was surrounded by a portico with seats under it. The Gemara (infra 45a) discusses whether it means the roof of the portico or the seats under it.

- (26) To avoid the crush on the following day.
- (27) Away from those of the public.
- (28) Since if it belonged to someone else it was invalid. V. supra 41b.
- (29) Even if it is not the first day.
- (30) The rite of the Lulab.
- (31) Since the commandment to take the Lulab in the Temple for seven days is Pentateuchal.
- (32) Sc. on what ground did the Rabbis institute a preventive measure against taking it?
- (33) The prohibition to take the Lulab on a Sabbath.

## Sukkah 43a

and thereby he will be carrying it for four cubits through a public domain.<sup>1</sup> And the same reason applies to the Shofar,<sup>2</sup> and the same reason applies to the Megillah.<sup>3</sup> But if so, let it<sup>4</sup> apply to the first days<sup>5</sup> also? — 'The first day' you say? Did not our Rabbis institute that it should be taken in one's home?<sup>6</sup> — That is quite correct as from after this enactment, but what can you answer as regards the time before the enactment? —

The fact is that with regard to the first day, the obligation to take the Lulab on which is Pentateuchal even in the Provinces<sup>7</sup> the Rabbis<sup>8</sup> did not enact a restrictive measure,<sup>9</sup> but with regard to the other days [the command to take the Lulab on which] does not Pentateuchally obtain in the Provinces,<sup>10</sup> the Rabbis did enact a restrictive measure.<sup>11</sup> But if this is so,<sup>12</sup> the same law should obtain at the present time also?<sup>13</sup> — We do not know when the New Moon was fixed.<sup>14</sup> But why should it not override the Sabbath<sup>15</sup> for them<sup>16</sup> since they know when the New Moon was fixed? —

The law is indeed so; for in our Mishnah we have learnt, **IF THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL, FELL ON A SABBATH**, all the people **BROUGHT THEIR LULABS TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT**, while in another Mishnah we have learnt [that they brought them] to the Synagogue,<sup>17</sup> consequently you may deduce from these that the former refers to the time when the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Temple was in existence while the latter refers to the time when the Temple was no longer in existence.<sup>18</sup> This is conclusive.<sup>19</sup> Whence do we derive that [the taking of the Lulab] is a Pentateuchal obligation in the Provinces? —

From what has been taught: And ye shall take<sup>20</sup> teaches that the Lulab must be taken in the hand of each one; to you teaches<sup>21</sup> that it must be yours, thus excluding a borrowed or a stolen [Lulab]; on the day<sup>22</sup> implies, even if it be the Sabbath; first<sup>23</sup> implies<sup>24</sup> even in the Province; the first<sup>25</sup> teaches that it overrides the first day of the Festival only.<sup>26</sup>

The Master said, ‘On the day<sup>27</sup> implies, even if it be Sabbath.’ But consider: [The taking of the Lulab] is ordinary carrying. Is a Scriptural verse then necessary to permit ordinary carrying?<sup>28</sup> Raba answered, It was necessary to have it only with regard to the preliminaries of the Lulab,<sup>29</sup> and this is in accordance with a ruling of that Tanna of whom it has been taught, The Lulab and all its preliminaries<sup>29</sup> override the Sabbath, so R. Eliezer.<sup>30</sup> What is the reason of R. Eliezer? —

Scripture says, ‘on the day,’ implying, even the Sabbath. But what do the Rabbis<sup>31</sup> make of the expression, on the day?—They need it to infer from it that on the day, [is the Lulab to be taken] but not at night. Then whence does R. Eliezer deduce that [the Lulab is to be taken] by day, and not at night? — He deduces it from the conclusion of the verse, ‘And ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God for seven days’, ‘days’ imply, but not nights. And the Rabbis?<sup>32</sup> —

If deduction were made from this verse, I might have said that we ought to compare ‘days’ [mentioned here] with ‘days’ mentioned with regard to the Sukkah<sup>33</sup> so that just as there [the expression of] ‘days’ includes nights, so here also [the expression of] ‘days’ includes nights.<sup>34</sup> And with

regard to the Sukkah itself whence do we derive [that the expression of ‘days’ includes nights]? —

From what our Rabbis have taught: Ye shall dwell in booths for seven days,<sup>33</sup> the expression of ‘days’ includes also the nights. You say that the expression of ‘days’ includes also the nights, perhaps it is not so and ‘days’ implies but not the nights, and this is really logical. For the word ‘days’ is used here,<sup>35</sup> and it is also used in connection with Lulab so that just as there it means days and not nights, so here also it must mean days and not nights. Or take it another way: The word ‘days’ is mentioned here,<sup>35</sup> and also in connection with the [seven days of the] investment,<sup>36</sup> so that just as there it means days and also nights,<sup>37</sup> so here also it must mean days and also the nights!

Let us then see to what it<sup>38</sup> is more comparable.<sup>39</sup> We should deduce a thing whose performance is a matter of the whole day<sup>38</sup> from a thing whose performance is a matter of the whole day,<sup>40</sup> and let no proof be adduced from something whose performance is only for one moment.<sup>41</sup> Or take it another way: We might deduce a thing which was ordained for future generations<sup>38</sup> from something whose performance also was ordained for future generations,<sup>41</sup> but let no proof be adduced from the investment which does not obtain for future generations!<sup>42</sup> [This is, therefore, an open question, but] Scripture explicitly repeats

- (1) Not with the intention of fulfilling a religious duty, but merely to receive instruction.
- (2) The ram's horn blown on the New Year.
- (3) The Scroll of Esther read on Purim. The Shofar may not be blown and the Megillah may not be read on the Sabbath for the same reason.
- (4) The restrictive measure.
- (5) Of the festival.
- (6) As stated in our Mishnah ad fin., and since it must be taken at home only, and not in the Synagogue, no one is likely to forget the prohibition against carrying it out.
- (7) Sc. all places outside the Temple.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (8) On account of its importance.
- (9) Either in the Temple or in the Provinces.
- (10) It only obtains in the Temple (v. infra).
- (11) Even in the Temple.
- (12) That because it obtains in the Provinces no preventive measure was enacted.
- (13) I.e., the command to take the Lulab should override on the first day the Sabbath even now when the Temple is no longer in existence.
- (14) Having to rely on the messages from Palestine which did not reach everywhere in time for the Festival, the fifteenth of the month may consequently not be actually the fifteenth and one taking the Lulab on that day might be transgressing the Sabbath.
- (15) Even at the present time.
- (16) The Palestinians.
- (17) Supra 41b. How then are the two Mishnahs to be reconciled.
- (18) Hence they brought their Lulabs to the Synagogue.
- (19) [Tosaf. a.l. points out that this conclusion is reversed later on, infra 44a, where the contradiction of the two Mishnahs is reconciled in a different manner].
- (20) Lev. XXIII, 40; emphasis on 'take'.
- (21) Ibid, emphasis on 'you'.
- (22) Ibid., emphasis on 'day'.
- (23) Ibid.
- (24) Since Temple was not mentioned.
- (25) Ibid., sc. the use of the He article.
- (26) The He restricting it to the 'well-known', or most important day of the Festival.
- (27) Lev. XXIII, 40; emphasis on 'day'.
- (28) Which is only a Rabbinical law enacted long after Scripture.
- (29) E.g., its preparation, its cutting from the tree and its binding.
- (30) Shab. 131b.
- (31) Who differ from R. Eliezer.
- (32) Why do they not deduce from this verse?
- (33) Lev. XXIII, 42.
- (34) Hence the necessity for the other verse.
- (35) In respect of Sukkah.
- (36) Of Aaron and his sons for the High Priesthood. (V. Lev. VIII).
- (37) Since the text explicitly mentioned day and night (v. Lev. VIII, 35).
- (38) The Sukkah.
- (39) To the seven days of investment or to the Lulab.
- (40) Investment (cf. Lev. VIII, 33 and 35).
- (41) The Lulab.
- (42) Each of the rites of Lulab and investment has one point of similarity with the Sukkah and one of difference from it. The Sukkah like the Lulab is an eternal commandment, but unlike it its performance is continuous. The seven days of

investment on the other hand were continuous but not ordained for future generations.

## Sukkah 43b

'Ye shall dwell' in order to point an analogy. It is stated here,<sup>1</sup> Ye shall dwell,<sup>2</sup> and with regard to the [seven days of] investment it is also stated, 'Ye shall dwell',<sup>3</sup> so that just as in that case the word 'days' includes also the nights, so here also 'days' includes the nights.

**THE WILLOW... SEVEN DAYS'. HOW IS THIS?** Why does the [ceremonial of the] willow-branch on the seventh day<sup>4</sup> override the Sabbath?<sup>5</sup> — R. Johanan answered, In order to publish the fact that its<sup>6</sup> is a [commandment] of the Torah. But if so, in the case of the Lulab also, why should it not override the Sabbath<sup>7</sup> in order to publish the fact that its is a [commandment] of the Torah? —

In the case of Lulab there is a restrictive enactment on account of the reason of Rabbah.<sup>9</sup> But if so, let us make the same restrictive enactment with regard to the willow also? — In the case of the willow-branch the emissaries of the Beth din would bring it<sup>10</sup> but the Lulab is entrusted to everyone.<sup>11</sup> But if so,<sup>12</sup> ought it not to override [the Sabbath] on any day?<sup>13</sup> — [If that were done] people would come to hold the Lulab<sup>14</sup> in light esteem. Then why should not [the willow] override [the Sabbath] on the first day of the Festival?<sup>15</sup>—

It will not be clear [that it is the rite of the willow that overrides the Sabbath, for] people might say that it is the Lulab which overrides it.<sup>16</sup> But why should not the Sabbath be overridden on any one of the other days?<sup>17</sup> — Since [the permission to override the Sabbath] was removed from the first day,<sup>18</sup> it was transferred to the seventh.<sup>19</sup> But if so,<sup>12</sup> why should it not override it at the present time also? — We do not know when New Moon was fixed.<sup>20</sup>

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

But in their case<sup>21</sup> since they know when New Moon was fixed, why should it not override [the Sabbath]? —

When Bar Hadya came,<sup>22</sup> he explained that this never happened.<sup>23</sup> When, however, Rabin came<sup>22</sup> and all the company that used to go down [from Palestine to Babylon]<sup>24</sup> they stated that it did happen, and that it did not override [the Sabbath]. Does not then the original difficulty arise? — R. Joseph answered, Who says that [the ceremonial of] the willow-branch is [performed] by the taking of it? Perhaps it is done by its being fixed [to the sides of the altar].<sup>25</sup>

Abaye raised an objection against him: THE CEREMONIALS OF THE LULAB AND THE WILLOW [CONTINUED FOR] SIX [DAYS] OR SEVEN. Does not [this<sup>26</sup> imply that the willow is] as the Lulab just as the [ceremonial of the] Lulab is [performed] by its being taken, so is that of the willow performed by its being taken?<sup>27</sup> — What an argument! The rite of each may have been carried out according to its own particular rules.<sup>28</sup>

Abaye raised a further objection against him: Every day they walked round the altar once, but on that day<sup>29</sup> they walked round it seven times.<sup>30</sup> Does not this mean, with the willow-branch?<sup>31</sup> No, with the Lulab.<sup>32</sup> But did not R. Nahman state in the name of Rabbah b. Abbuha [that the circuit was made] with the willow branch? — The other<sup>33</sup> answered him, He told you, ‘with the willow-branch’ and I say ‘with the Lulab’.

It was stated, R. Eleazar stated [that the circuit was made] with the Lulab; R. Samuel b. Nathan citing R. Hanina stated [that it was made] with the willow-branch. And so said R. Nahman who had it from Rabbah b. Abbuha, With the willow-branch.

Raba said to R. Isaac the son of Rabbah b. bar Hana, Come, O Son of the Law, and I will tell you of an excellent statement which your father made. With reference to what we have learnt, ‘Every day they walked round the altar once, and on that day they went round seven times’,<sup>34</sup> your father citing R. Eleazar stated, [This was done] with the Lulab.

He raised an objection against him: The rite of the Lulab overrides the Sabbath on the first day,<sup>35</sup> and that of the willow-branch on the last day.<sup>36</sup> On one occasion the seventh day of the [ceremonial of the] willow-branch fell on a Sabbath, and they brought saplings of willows on the Sabbath eve and placed them in the courtyard of the Temple. The Boethusians,<sup>37</sup> having discovered them, took and hid them under some stones.<sup>38</sup> On the morrow some of the ‘Amme ha-arez<sup>39</sup> discovered them and removed them from under the stones, and the priests brought them in and fixed them in the sides of the altar. [The reason for hiding the willows was that] the Boethusians do not admit that the beating of the willow-branch<sup>40</sup> overrides the Sabbath.<sup>41</sup> Thus<sup>42</sup> we see clearly that [the performance of the willow ceremonial is] in the taking of it?<sup>43</sup> — This is a refutation.

Then why should it<sup>44</sup> not override [the Sabbath]?<sup>45</sup> — Since with us<sup>46</sup> it does not override [the Sabbath]<sup>47</sup> it does not override it with them<sup>48</sup> either.<sup>49</sup> But is there not the first day of the Festival on which [the rite of the Lulab] does not override the Sabbath for us,<sup>50</sup> but does it for them?<sup>48</sup> —

(1) In respect of Sukkah.

(2) Lev. XXIII, 42.

(3) Ibid. VIII, 35.

(4) Of the Festival.

(5) Sc. why was no preventive measure enacted in its case as in that of Lulab supra?

(6) Though not specifically mentioned.

(7) On every day of the Festival (not only the first) that falls on the Sabbath.

(8) Sc. taking it on all the seven days, though this is not specifically mentioned in the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Pentateuch, since the period indicated in Lev. XXIII, 40, may refer to other forms of rejoicing.

(9) Supra 42b ad fin.

(10) On the Sabbath eve, to be borne round the altar by the priests on the morrow. For these men, who are presumed to be acquainted with the Law, no preventive measures were called for.

(11) Had no preventive measure been enacted, a breach in the Sabbath laws might have occurred.

(12) That in the case of the willow no preventive measure was deemed necessary and that Pentateuchally it must be taken all the seven days of the Festival.

(13) Of the Festival which falls on the Sabbath, and not only on the seventh.

(14) Since it overrides the Sabbath only the first day.

(15) As is the case with the Lulab.

(16) The inference might be made that the overriding of the Sabbath is mainly due to the Lulab and only incidentally to the separate willow.

(17) Sc. why was preference given to the seventh day?

(18) For the reason given supra.

(19) Another conspicuous day. The middle days are not so conspicuous as the first and the seventh.

(20) V. supra p. 195, n. 9. The day we assume to be the seventh may in fact be the sixth, and the Sabbath is thus overridden on the wrong day.

(21) Sc. the Palestinians.

(22) From Palestine to Babylon.

(23) The date of the beginning of the month was so arranged that the seventh day of the Festival never coincided with the Sabbath. This was effected by adding a day to the previous month or to any other of the preceding months.

(24) [נְחוּתִי] Lit., 'going down', a term denoting a group of Palestinian 'traveling scholars' of the fourth century who used to journey to and fro between Palestine and Babylonia in order to transmit the teachings and traditions of the Academies of one country to the other, v. Funk S., *Die Juden in Babylonian I*, p. 146].

(25) And since now there is no altar and the rite cannot be properly performed, the Sabbath may not be overridden.

(26) The juxtaposition of the two.

(27) How then could R. Joseph suggest that the willow was fixed to the sides of the altar?

(28) The appearance of the two nouns in juxtaposition is no proof that the performance of the two rites was identical.

(29) The seventh day of the Festival.

(30) Infra 45a.

(31) And, therefore, the duty is obviously performed by the mere holding of the willow-branch. An objection against R.

Joseph (cf. supra n. 7).

(32) After the willow-branch had been fixed in the sides of the altar.

(33) R. Joseph.

(34) Infra 45a.

(35) Lit., 'at its beginning'.

(36) Lit., 'at its end'.

(37) A sect closely related to the Sadducees. Tradition traces their origin to Boethus a pupil of Antigonus of Soko. More probably followers of Boethus or Simeon b. Boethus who was made High Priest by Herod in 25 B.C.E. V. J.E. III, p. 285.

(38) The Boethusians, knowing that the Pharisees would not remove the stones on the Sabbath, hoped thereby effectively to prevent a ceremony in which they did not believe.

(39) Who are unacquainted with the Sabbath laws.

(40) The willow-branch, according to Rabbinic law, was beaten on the ground. Cf. Mishnah infra 45a.

(41) Tosef. Suk. III.

(42) Since the willow-branch had to be beaten.

(43) Not merely in fixing it to the altar.

(44) The taking of the willow on the seventh day of the Festival.

(45) In Palestine, where they know when the New Moon was fixed.

(46) In Babylon and all other countries outside Palestine.

(47) On account of our ignorance of the day when the New Moon was fixed.

(48) The Palestinians.

(49) In order that no distinctions be made between one country and another.

(50) In Babylon and all other countries outside Palestine.

## Sukkah 44a

I will answer! For them also it does not override [the Sabbath]. Does not then a contradiction arise between those two Mishnahs, since one teaches 'all the people BROUGHT THEIR LULABS TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT',<sup>1</sup> and the other Mishnah teaches [that they brought them] to the Synagogue,<sup>2</sup> and we answered,<sup>3</sup> did we not, that the one referred to Temple times and the other to the time after the destruction of the Temple? —

## SUCCA – 29b-56b

No; both refer to Temple times,<sup>4</sup> but there is nevertheless no contradiction since the one refers to the Sanctuary and the others to the Provinces.<sup>6</sup> Abaye said to Rabbah,<sup>7</sup> Why in the case of the Lulab do we perform the ceremony for seven days in commemoration of the Sanctuary, whereas in the case of the willow-branch we do not perform the ceremony for seven days in commemoration of the Sanctuary?<sup>8</sup> —

He answered him, Since one fulfills the obligation [of taking the willow-branch] with the willow-branch on the Lulab. But the former asked, does not one do it<sup>9</sup> on account of the Lulab?<sup>10</sup> And if you will answer that one first raises it once<sup>11</sup> and then raises it again,<sup>12</sup> is it not a daily occurrence that we do not so act? —

R. Zebid answered in the name of Raba, In the case of the Lulab which is a Pentateuchal precept we perform the ceremony for seven days in commemoration of the Sanctuary; in the case of the willow-branch which is only a Rabbinical precept, we do not perform the ceremony for seven days in commemoration of the Sanctuary. According to whom [is this statement]<sup>13</sup> made? If you will say, According to Abba Saul,<sup>14</sup> did he not say: It is written, willows of the brook,<sup>15</sup> implying<sup>16</sup> two, one referring to the [willow-branch in the] Lulab and the other to [the willow-branch for use in] the Sanctuary?<sup>17</sup> If you will say, It is according to the Rabbis, did they not have it as an accepted tradition, since R. Assi citing R. Johanan who had it from R. Nehunya of the Plain of Beth Hawartan,<sup>18</sup> stated, The laws of the ten plants, the willow-branch and water libation were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai?<sup>19</sup>

Rather, said R. Zebid, in the name of Raba, In the case of the rite of the Lulab, which has a Pentateuchal origin<sup>20</sup> for its performance in the Provinces, we perform it for seven days in commemoration of the

Sanctuary; in the case of the rite of the willow-branch, which has no Pentateuchal origin for its performance in the Provinces, we do not perform it for seven days in commemoration of the Sanctuary. Resh Lakish ruled, Priests suffering from a physical blemish<sup>21</sup> were permitted<sup>22</sup> to enter between the Ulam<sup>23</sup> and the altar in order to fulfill the precept of the willow-branch.<sup>24</sup> Said R. Johanan to him, Who said so? —

‘Who said so?’ Did he not himself say so,<sup>25</sup> since R. Assi citing R. Johanan who had it from R. Nehunya of the Plain of Beth Hawartan stated, The laws of the ten plants, the willow-branch and water libation were given to Moses upon Mount Sinai?<sup>26</sup> —

He rather meant this: Who said that [the precept<sup>27</sup> is fulfilled] by taking,<sup>28</sup> perhaps it is fulfilled by fixing,<sup>29</sup> who said that it may be done by priests with a blemish, perhaps it [may be done] only by unblemished priests? It was stated, R. Johanan and R. Joshua b. Levi differ. One holds that the rite of the willow-branch is an institution of the prophets,<sup>30</sup> the other holds that the willow-branch is a usage of the prophets.<sup>31</sup> It can be concluded that it was R. Johanan who said, ‘It is an institution of the prophets’, since R. Abbahu stated in the name of R. Johanan, ‘The rite of the willow-branch is an institution of the prophets’. This is conclusive. Said R. Zera to R. Abbahu, Did then R. Johanan say so?<sup>32</sup> Did not R. Johanan in fact state in the name of R. Nehunya of the Plain of Beth Hawartan that ‘the law of the ten plants, the willow-branch and the water libation were given to Moses on Mount Sinai’? —

[The other] was appalled for a while,<sup>33</sup> and then he answered, They were forgotten<sup>34</sup> and the prophets<sup>35</sup> reinstated them. But could R. Johanan say so?<sup>36</sup> Did not R. Johanan in fact state, ‘What I said was yours was in fact theirs’?<sup>37</sup> —

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Rather<sup>38</sup> [answer thus]: This is no difficulty,

- (1) Supra 42b.
- (2) Supra 43a.
- (3) V. supra 43a.
- (4) [When messengers were sent forth to the Diaspora informing them when the New Moon had been fixed, v. Strashun].
- (5) Which speaks of carrying the Lulab ‘to the Synagogue’.
- (6) After the destruction of the Temple, however, no such messengers were sent forth, so that the taking of the Lulab on the Sabbath is forbidden within as well as without Palestine.
- (7) So Bah. Cur. edd., ‘Raba’.
- (8) The latter ceremony is performed on one day only (cf. Rashi, a.l.).
- (9) Take a willow-branch with the Lulab.
- (10) And not in fulfillment of the precept of the willow-branch.
- (11) To fulfill the precept of the Lulab.
- (12) To fulfill the precept of the willow-branch.
- (13) That the rite of the willow-branch is only Rabbinical.
- (14) Supra 34a.
- (15) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (16) Since the plural is used.
- (17) Now since both are derived from the Pentateuch the latter like the former must obviously be a Pentateuchal commandment.
- (18) V. Ta’an. Sonc. ed., p. 7, n. 2.
- (19) Supra 34a, q.v. notes.
- (20) For the first day.
- (21) Though such priests were throughout the year forbidden not only to take part in the Temple ceremonies but also to enter the Sanctuary (cf. Kelim I).
- (22) In this case an exception was made.
- (23) The Hall leading to the interior of the Temple. V. Mid. IV, 7.
- (24) Which necessitated a circuit round the altar, and which could not possibly be done without passing between the Ulam and the altar.
- (25) The questioner assumed that R. Johanan meant, ‘Who said that the rite of the willow-branch is a religious duty?’
- (26) Supra.
- (27) Of the willow-branch.
- (28) So that even those who suffer from blemishes must enter and thus tread upon ground forbidden to them.
- (29) In which case one eligible priest can perform the rite for all the others.
- (30) Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the prophets of the Second Temple to whom tradition ascribes many enactments.

(31) Sc. they had it only as a custom, and since it did not have the force of a law, no benediction over it is necessary.

(32) That the rite of the willow was an institution of the prophets.

(33) Cf. Dan. IV, 16.

(34) During the exile.

(35) At the divine commandment.

(36) That the commandments were forgotten during the exile.

(37) B.K. 117b. Sc. the knowledge of the Law which he first thought was the possession of the Palestinians was in fact in the hands of the Babylonians (Rashi). How then could it be said that he held that the Torah was forgotten during the Babylonian exile? [R. Han. (v. Tosaf.) renders thus: ‘One of yours (sc. a Babylonian scholar) said that it (the rite of taking the willow-branch) is theirs’, i.e., of Rabbinic origin].

(38) [Lit., ‘But’, so MS.M. The answer of R. Abbahu is being rejected and another is given to reconcile the two statements of R. Johanan].

## Sukkah 44b

since one statement<sup>1</sup> refers to the Sanctuary and the other<sup>2</sup> to the Provinces. R. Ammi ruled, The willow-branch is required to have a minimum size,<sup>3</sup> it must be taken separately only,<sup>4</sup> and no man can fulfill his obligation with the willow-branch in the Lulab. But since the Master said, ‘It must be taken separately only’ is it not self-evident that ‘no man can fulfill his obligation with the willow-branch in the Lulab’? —

I might have said that that applies only where one does not lift [the Lulab] a second time, but not where one does lift it a second time,<sup>5</sup> therefore he informs us that it is not so. R. Hisda citing R. Isaac, however, ruled, A man may fulfill his obligation with the willow-branch in the Lulab.<sup>6</sup> What is its prescribed minimum?<sup>7</sup> —

R. Nahman said, Three fresh twigs with leaves. R. Shesheth, however, said, Even one leaf and one twig. ‘One leaf and one twig’! Can such a rule be imagined?<sup>8</sup> —



# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Say rather, Even one leaf on one twig.<sup>9</sup> Aibu<sup>10</sup> related, I was once standing in the presence of R. Eleazar b. Zadok when a man brought a willow-branch before him, and he took it and shook<sup>11</sup> it over and over again without reciting any benediction, for he was of the opinion that it<sup>12</sup> was merely a usage of the prophets.<sup>13</sup> Aibu<sup>10</sup> and Hezekiah, the maternal grandsons of Rab, brought a willow-branch before Rab, and he shook it over and over again without reciting a benediction, for he was of the opinion that it<sup>12</sup> was merely a usage of the prophets.<sup>13</sup> Aibu stated, I was standing in the presence of R. Eleazar b. Zadok when a certain man came before him and said to him, 'I possess cities, vineyards and olive trees, and the inhabitants of the cities come<sup>14</sup> and hoe the vineyards and eat the olives.<sup>15</sup> Is this<sup>16</sup> proper or improper?' —

'This', the other replied, 'is improper'. As the man was about to leave him and depart, [R. Eleazar] observed, 'It is now forty years that I have dwelt in this land, and I have never seen a man walking in the paths of righteousness as this man'. The man thereupon returned and said to him, 'What should be done?' he answered him, 'Abandon the olives to the poor and pay yourself for hoeing the vineyards'. But is hoeing permitted [during the Sabbatical year]? Has it not in fact been taught: But the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie still<sup>17</sup> means, 'Let it rest' from hoeing and 'lie still' as regards the removal of stones?—

R. Ukba b. Hama replied, There are two kinds of hoeing; one consists in closing up the fissures and the other in aerating the soil.<sup>18</sup> Aerating the soil is forbidden<sup>19</sup> but closing up the fissures<sup>20</sup> is permitted. Aibu citing R. Eleazar b. Zadok ruled, One should not walk more than three parasangs on the Sabbath eve.<sup>21</sup> R. Kahana observed, They made this statement only [in reference to a man who was going to] his home,<sup>22</sup> but if he was going to his inn<sup>23</sup> he relies upon

[the food] which he has with him. Others say that R. Kahana observed, The statement<sup>24</sup> was necessary even in the case of a man [who was going] to his home.<sup>25</sup> R. Kahana stated, It actually happened with me, that<sup>26</sup> I did not find even a fishpie.<sup>27</sup>

**HOW WAS [THE CEREMONIAL OF] THE LULAB CARRIED OUT? A tanna recited before R. Nahman, 'Arranged them upon the roof<sup>28</sup> of the portico'. The other said to him**

- (1) That it was a law given to Moses on Mount Sinai.
- (2) That it was an institution of the prophets.
- (3) This is given infra.
- (4) Nothing else may be bound together with it.
- (5) Once in fulfillment of the rite of Lulab and a second time in fulfillment of that of the willow.
- (6) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'on the first festival day of the feast', which is difficult to explain.
- (7) Sc. of the willow-branches.
- (8) Obviously not
- (9) The size prescribed supra 32b applies only to the willow-branches that were bound with the Lulab.
- (10) This Aibu, the father of Rab, is the great-grandfather of the Aibu mentioned later (v. Rashi). R. Eleazar b. Zadok before whom he stood, the grandson of R. Eleazar b. Zadok I, lived in the second century.
- (11) So Rashi.
- (12) The shaking of the willow outside the Temple.
- (13) Only a Pentateuchal or Rabbinical rite requires a benediction.
- (14) During the Sabbatical Year, when the produce should be Hefker (v. Glos.).
- (15) As payment for hoeing the vineyards.
- (16) The payment out of the produce with which all trading is forbidden.
- (17) Ex. XXIII, 11.
- (18) Breaking up the clods and allowing the air to permeate to the roots. Lit., 'to make the trees strong'.
- (19) Since the tree is thereby improved.
- (20) Which only serves to protect the tree.
- (21) Lest he is unable to reach his destination before sunset. He should rather remain where he is, allowing himself sufficient time in which to prepare his Sabbath meals.
- (22) Without first informing them of his arrival. Were he to arrive after or near sunset it would be too late to prepare for him his Sabbath meals. As he might have expected his people to be ready for him there might be a clash.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

(23) The people of which he does not expect to prepare his meals without notice.

(24) Of Aibu.

(25) Where he is sure to find at least some food, much more so does it apply to an inn, since he cannot rely upon finding there any food at all for the Sabbath.

(26) Arriving unexpectedly.

(27) 'Kassa deharsana', a concoction of fish-hash and flour fried in the fish oil. It represents the minimum of a meal.

(28) His reading in our Mishnah was not על גב על גב האיציטבה 'upon the portico' but על גב האיציטבה 'upon the roof of the portico'.

## Sukkah 45a

'Does one then need to dry them?'<sup>1</sup> Say rather, 'Upon the portico'.<sup>2</sup> Rehaba citing R.<sup>3</sup> Judah stated, The Temple Mount had a double colonnade, one colonnade being within the other.<sup>4</sup>

**MISHNAH.** HOW WAS THE PRECEPT OF THE WILLOW-BRANCH [CARRIED OUT]? THERE WAS A PLACE BELOW JERUSALEM CALLED MOZA.<sup>5</sup> THEY WENT DOWN THERE AND GATHERED THENCE YOUNG WILLOW-BRANCHES AND THEN CAME AND FIXED THEM AT THE SIDES OF THE ALTAR SO THAT THEIR TOPS BENT OVER THE ALTAR. THEY THEN SOUNDED<sup>6</sup> A TEKI'AH [LONG BLAST], A TERU'AH [TREMULOUS BLAST] AND AGAIN A TEKI'AH.<sup>7</sup> EVERY DAY<sup>8</sup> THEY WENT ROUND THE ALTAR ONCE, SAYING, 'WE BESEECH THEE, O LORD, SAVE NOW, WE BESEECH THEE, O LORD, MAKE US NOW TO PROSPER'.<sup>9</sup> R. JUDAH SAID, [THEY WERE SAYING],<sup>10</sup> 'ANI WAHO,<sup>11</sup> SAVE NOW'. BUT ON THAT DAY<sup>12</sup> THEY WENT ROUND THE ALTAR SEVEN TIMES.

WHEN<sup>13</sup> THEY DEPARTED, WHAT DID THEY SAY? 'THINE, O ALTAR, IS THE BEAUTY! THINE, O ALTAR, IS THE BEAUTY!' R. ELIEZER SAID, [THEY WERE SAYING,] 'TO THE LORD AND TO THEE, O ALTAR, TO THE LORD AND TO THEE, O ALTAR'. AS WAS ITS PERFORMANCE<sup>14</sup> ON

A WEEKDAY, SO WAS ITS PERFORMANCE ON THE SABBATH, SAVE THAT THEY GATHERED THEM<sup>15</sup> ON THE EVE [OF THE SABBATH,] AND PLACED THEM IN GOLDEN BASINS THAT THEY MIGHT NOT BECOME MILDEWED. R. JOHANAN B. BEROKA SAID, THEY USED TO BRING PALM TWIGS AND BEAT THEM ON THE GROUND AT THE SIDES OF THE ALTAR, AND THAT DAY WAS CALLED '[THE DAY OF] THE BEATING OF THE PALM TWIGS'. THEY USED TO TAKE THEIR LULABS FROM THE HANDS OF THE CHILDREN AND EAT THEIR ETHROGS.<sup>16</sup>

**GEMARA.** It was taught, It<sup>17</sup> was the place called Kolonia. Then why does our Tanna call it MOZA?<sup>18</sup> — Since it was exempt from the king's tax, he calls it MOZA.

AND THEN CAME AND FIXED THEM AT THE SIDES OF, etc. A Tanna taught, They were large<sup>19</sup> and long and eleven cubits high, so that they might bend over the altar one cubit.<sup>20</sup> Meremar citing Mar Zutra observed, Deduce therefrom<sup>21</sup> that they<sup>15</sup> were laid upon the base [of the altar],<sup>22</sup> for if you were to assume that they were placed on the ground, consider this: It<sup>23</sup> rose up one cubit and drew in one cubit, and this<sup>24</sup> formed the base. It<sup>25</sup> then rose up five cubits and drew in one cubit, and this<sup>26</sup> formed the circuit; it<sup>27</sup> [then] rose up three cubits, and this<sup>28</sup> was the place of the horns.<sup>29</sup> Now<sup>30</sup> how could they<sup>31</sup> bend over the altar?<sup>32</sup> Consequently it may be deduced from this that they were laid on the base.<sup>33</sup> This is conclusive. R. Abbahu said, What is its Scriptural proof?<sup>34</sup> —

Since it is said, Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto the horns of the altar.<sup>35</sup> R. Abbahu citing R. Eleazar stated, Whosoever takes the Lulab with its binding and the willow-branch with its wreathing is regarded by Scripture as though he had built an altar and offered thereon a sacrifice. For it is said,

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

- (1) Obviously not, since a dried Lulab is in fact invalid.
- (2) Not upon its roof.
- (3) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'Rab'. [The reference is to Rab Judah the Amora, whom Rehaba designated as Rabbi because he was his teacher, v. Bez., Sonc. ed., p. 54, n. 9]
- (4) V. Pes., Sonc. ed., p. 59, nn. 10-11.
- (5) The Gemara infra identifies the place. Cf. Josh. XVIII, 26. The name has been revived in a modern colony in the same locality.
- (6) On the Shofar.
- (7) V. R.H. 33b.
- (8) Of the first six days of the Festival.
- (9) Ps. CXVIII, 25.
- (10) In order to avoid the repetition of the Tetragrammaton.
- (11) יהי ויהי the numerical value of which equals that of the Hebrew for 'we beseech Thee, O Lord'. For other explanations cf. Rashi, a.l.
- (12) The seventh day of the Festival.
- (13) Bah, and apparently also Rashi, delete this paragraph.
- (14) The ceremonial of the willow-branch.
- (15) The willow-branches.
- (16) And the act was not regarded as robbing but as a form of sport associated with the jollity of the day. An alternative translation: 'Immediately the children pulled out their Lulabs (from their wreaths) and ate their Ethrogs'. (Tosaf. a.l. Bertinoro and Rashi infra 46b).
- (17) MOZA.
- (18) Meaning 'exempt'.
- (19) Var. lec. 'tender'. (Ronsburg).
- (20) The measurements are discussed presently.
- (21) From the statement that they bent 'over the altar one cubit'.
- (22) I.e., at a height of one cubit from the ground.
- (23) The altar at its base.
- (24) The platform, one cubit in height and 32 X 32 cubits in area.
- (25) The altar above the base.
- (26) The second platform, 30 X 30 cubits in area and five cubits in height, that rested on the base.
- (27) The topmost part of the altar.
- (28) The top, three cubits in height and 28 X 28 cubits in area, that rested on the circuit.
- (29) Vertical projections, one cubit cube, at each of the four corners of the top of the altar. Mid. III, 1.
- (30) Since, as has been shown, the height from the base of the altar to the top was nine cubits.
- (31) The willow-branches that were eleven cubits high and stood on the ground.
- (32) The willow-branch, placed in a slanting position against the altar (nine cubits in height) and removed sufficiently from its base to allow

for the horizontal distance of two cubits from the side of the base to the top of the altar, would not project at all beyond the top of the altar; what then, would remain for bending over?

(33) And leaned against the side of the circuit, thus gaining the two cubits of the height and width of the base and leaving two cubits length of willow-branch sufficient to bend over the top of the altar one cubit.

(34) That the willow-branches overhung the top of the altar.

(35) Ps. CXVIII, 27. The height of the horns was one cubit above the top of the altar, and boughs that reached to the top of the horns naturally bent one cubit over the altar top.

## Sukkah 45b

Bind the festival<sup>1</sup> with myrtle branches<sup>2</sup> even unto the horns of the altar.<sup>3</sup> R. Jeremiah citing R. Simeon b. Yohai, and R. Johanan citing R. Simeon of Mahoz<sup>4</sup> who had it from R. Johanan of Makkuth stated, Whosoever makes an additions<sup>5</sup> to the Festival by eating and drinkings<sup>6</sup> is regarded by Scripture as though he had builded an altar and offered thereon a sacrifice. For it is said, Make an addition to<sup>7</sup> the Festival with fat cattle,<sup>8</sup> even to the horns of the altar.<sup>9</sup>

Hezekiah citing R. Jeremiah who had it from R. Simeon b. Yohai stated, In the case of all commandments,<sup>10</sup> one does not fulfill one's obligation unless [the objects involved] are in the same condition as when they grow,<sup>11</sup> for it is said, Acacia wood standing up.<sup>12</sup> So it was also taught, 'Acacia wood standing up,' implies that they should stand in the manner of their growth. Another interpretation: 'Standing up' implies that they held<sup>13</sup> their [gold] overlaying.<sup>14</sup>

Another interpretation of 'Standing up'.' Lest you may say, 'Their hope is lost, their expectation is frustrated',<sup>15</sup> Scripture expressly states, 'Acacia wood standing up'<sup>12</sup> implying that they will stand for ever and to all eternity. Hezekiah further stated in the name of R. Jeremiah who said it in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, I am able<sup>16</sup>

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

to exempt the whole world from judgment from the day that I was born until now, and were Eliezer, my son, to be with me [we could exempt it] from the day of the creation of the world to the present time, and were Jotham the son of Uzziah<sup>17</sup> with us, [we could exempt it] from the creation of the world to its final end.<sup>18</sup>

Hezekiah further stated in the name of R. Jeremiah who said it in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, I have seen the sons of heaven<sup>19</sup> and they are but few. If there be a thousand, I and my son are among them; if a hundred, I and my son are among them; and if only two, they are I and my son. Are they then so few? Did not Raba in fact state,<sup>20</sup> The row [of righteous men immediately] before the Holy One, blessed be He, consists of eighteen thousand, for it is said, It shall be eighteen thousand round about?<sup>21</sup> —

This is no difficulty: The former number refers to those who see Him ‘through a bright speculum, the latter to those who see Him through a dim one.<sup>22</sup> But are those who see Him through a bright speculum so few? Did not Abaye in fact state, The world never has less than thirty-six righteous men who are vouchsafed a sight of the Shechinah every day, for it is said, Happy are they that wait *lo*<sup>23</sup> [for Him] and the numerical value of *lo* is thirty-six? — There is no difficulty: The latter number<sup>24</sup> refers to those who may enter [the Presence] with permission, the former<sup>25</sup> to those who may enter without permission.

**WHEN THEY DEPARTED, WHAT DID THEY SAY?** But does not one thereby<sup>26</sup> associate the name of God<sup>27</sup> with something else<sup>28</sup> concerning which it has been taught, Whosoever associates the name of God with something else is uprooted from the world, as it is said, Save unto the Lord alone?<sup>29</sup> — It is this that was meant: **TO THE LORD** we give thanks, **AND TO THEE** we offer

praise, **TO THE LORD** we give thanks **AND THEE** we laud.

**AS WAS ITS PERFORMANCE ON A WEEKDAY.** Said R. Huna, What is the reason of R. Johanan b. Beroka? Because it is written, Branches,<sup>30</sup> which<sup>31</sup> implies two, one for the Lulab and one for the altar. But the Rabbis say, The word ‘branches’ is written defectively.<sup>32</sup> R. Levi explained, [The reason of R. Johanan b. Beroka<sup>33</sup> is that Israel is] compared to the date-palm; as the date-palm has but one heart<sup>34</sup> also Israel has but one heart [which is completely devoted] to their Father in Heaven.<sup>35</sup> Rab Judah citing Samuel stated, [The benediction is recited over] the Lulab for seven [days] and over the Sukkah only on one day.<sup>36</sup> What is the reason? —

In the case of the Lulab where the nights form breaks between the days,<sup>37</sup> each day involves a separate commandment; in the case of the Sukkah where the nights do not form breaks between the days,<sup>38</sup> all seven days are regarded as one long day. Rabbah b. Bar Hana, however, stated in the name of R. Johanan, [The benediction is recited over] the Sukkah for seven days and over the Lulab but one day.<sup>36</sup> What is the reason? —

For the Sukkah which is a Pentateuchal precept [the benediction must be recited all the] seven [days]; in the case of the Lulab which is but a Rabbinical enactment [a benediction on] one day suffices. When Rabin came,<sup>39</sup> he stated in the name of R. Johanan, [The benediction is recited over] the one as well as the other [all] seven [days]. R. Joseph ruled, Lay hold fast to the decision of Rabbah b. Bar Hana, since with regard to Sukkah,<sup>40</sup> all the Amoras adopt the same position as he.

An objection was raised:

(1) Sc. the Lulab that is taken at the Festival.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (2) Lit., 'its twistings or plaitings', reference to the shape of the foliage. E.V., 'Order the festival procession with boughs'.
- (3) Ps. CXVIII, 27; sc. the act is like the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood upon the horns of the altar.
- (4) A place in Palestine not to be confused with Mahuza in Babylon.
- (5) Lit., 'a binding'.
- (6) Sc. enjoys himself with better food and drink on the Festival, or, alternatively, enjoys himself in this way on the day following the Festival. The alternative interpretation is the origin of the name Isru hag given to the day after a festival.
- (7) Lit., 'bind'.
- (8) Heb. ba'abothim is taken as derived from 'abeh, 'thick', 'fat'.
- (9) Ps. CXVIII, 27. For E.V. v. supra.
- (10) E.g., the Lulab and willow-branch.
- (11) The roots downwards and the tops upwards.
- (12) Ex. XXVI, 15, in reference to the walls of the Tabernacle.
- (13) Lit., 'cause to stand'.
- (14) Sc. the plates of gold were nailed to the boards with golden nails, the plates alone not being long enough to stand in independence of the boards.
- (15) Sc. since the disappearance of the Tabernacle of Testimony the boards will never again reappear.
- (16) On account of his troubles and suffering.
- (17) King of Judah. Tradition sees in him one of the most righteous and pious of kings, one who loyally observed the fifth commandment in being content to act as regent during his father's reign without even aspiring to the throne, and one who always gave his ruling in the name of his father.
- (18) Simeon b. Yohai, who is the reputed author of the Zohar, spent thirteen years in a cave with his son, hiding from the Romans, and suffering great privation.
- (19) Those who will see the Presence of God in the Hereafter.
- (20) So in Sanh. 97b (where the entire passage is reproduced with some variants); the text here is in slight disorder.
- (21) Ezek. XLVIII, 35.
- (22) They receive only a clouded vision of the Divine Presence.
- (23) Isa. XXX, 18.
- (24) Thirty-six.
- (25) Two, R. Simeon b. Yohai and his son.
- (26) By saying, TO THEE LORD AND TO THEE, O ALTAR.
- (27) Lit., 'heaven'.
- (28) Thus suggesting a co-deity.

- (29) Ex. XXII, 19; Sanh. 63a.
- (30) Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (31) The use of the plural.
- (32) In the singular, v. supra 34b.
- (33) For prescribing a special Lulab rite for the altar.
- (34) Sc. its marrow is found in the central branch only.
- (35) And expresses thus its devotion by this symbolic act.
- (36) The first.
- (37) Since the commandment of the Lulab does not obtain at night (v. supra 43a).
- (38) Since the commandment obtains both by day and by night (ibid.).
- (39) From Palestine to Babylon.
- (40) That the benediction must be recited on each of the seven days.

## Sukkah 46a

He who makes a Lulab<sup>1</sup> for his own use shall recite the benediction, 'Blessed [art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe] who has kept us in life, and hast preserved us, and enabled us to reach this season'. When he takes it to fulfill therewith his obligation, he shall say, 'Blessed [art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe] who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments, and commanded us concerning the taking of the Lulab' and even though he has recited the benediction on the first day, he must again recite it on all seven days. He who makes a Sukkah for his own use shall recite the benediction, 'Blessed [art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe] who kept us in life, and sustained us, etc.' When he enters the Sukkah to take up his abode therein he shall say, '. . . Who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments and commanded us to dwell in the Sukkah'; and once he has recited the benediction on the first day, he has no need to repeat it [on subsequent days].<sup>3</sup>

Now is there not a contradiction between the one statement concerning the Lulab and the other,<sup>4</sup> and between the one concerning Sukkah and the other?<sup>5</sup> The difficulty between the one statement concerning the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Lulab and the other may well be disposed of, since one might refer to Temple times and the other to the time when the Temple was no longer in existence; but does not the difficulty concerning the two statements about the Sukkah remain? —

The question<sup>7</sup> is one in dispute between Tannas, as it has been taught, Whenever a man puts on his Tefillin he must<sup>9</sup> recite the benediction; so Rabbi,<sup>10</sup> but the Sages ruled, He recites the benediction in the morning only.<sup>11</sup> It was stated:<sup>12</sup> Abaye ruled, The law is in agreement with Rabbi, while Raba ruled, The law is in agreement with the Rabbis. R. Mari the son of Samuel's daughter remarked, I noticed that Raba himself did not act in accordance with his own ruling<sup>13</sup> but rising early, he would go to the privy, emerge and wash his hands, put on his Tefillin and recite the benediction, and when he had to attend to his needs a second time he would<sup>14</sup> go to the privy, emerge and wash his hands, put on his Tefillin and recite the benediction again. We also act in accordance with the ruling of Rabbi and recite the benediction<sup>15</sup> all seven days.<sup>16</sup>

Mar Zutra remarked, I notice that R. Papi recited the benediction whenever he put on his Tefillin.<sup>17</sup> The Rabbis of the school of R. Ashi recited the benediction whenever they touched their Tefillin.<sup>18</sup> Rab Judah citing Samuel ruled: The commandment of Lulab<sup>19</sup> applies to all the seven days,<sup>16</sup> but R. Joshua b. Levi ruled, The commandment of the Lulab<sup>19</sup> applies to the first day only,<sup>20</sup> and subsequently it is but an ordinance of the Elders;<sup>21</sup> while R. Isaac ruled, [The taking of the Lulab on] every day, and even on the first one is but an ordinance of the Elders. But have we not an established rule that on the first day it is a Pentateuchal commandment? —

Say rather, Except on the first day. But if so, is not this<sup>22</sup> identical with the ruling of R. Joshua b. Levi? — Read, And so said R.

Isaac. Rab also is of the opinion that the commandment of the Lulab<sup>19</sup> applies to all seven days,<sup>23</sup> for R. Hiyya b. Ashi citing Rab stated, One who kindles the Hanukkah lamp<sup>24</sup> must recite a benediction.<sup>25</sup>

R. Jeremiah ruled, He who sees the Hanukkah light<sup>26</sup> must recite the benediction. What benediction does one recite? — Rab Judah answered, On the first day he who kindles the light must recite three benedictions<sup>27</sup> and he who sees it must recite two;<sup>28</sup> henceforth he who kindles the lights recites two benedictions<sup>29</sup> and he who sees them only one.<sup>30</sup> What is the benediction? — ‘Blessed [art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe] who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments, and commanded us to kindle the light of Hanukkah’.<sup>27</sup> But where<sup>31</sup> did He command us? — [The commandment is deduced from the verse,] Thou shalt not turn aside.<sup>32</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac replied, [Deduction is made from the verse,] Ask thy father, and he will declare unto thee.<sup>33</sup> (Which [benediction] does one omit?<sup>34</sup> — The benediction on the season.<sup>35</sup> Might it not be suggested that one omits the benediction of the miracle?<sup>36</sup> — The miracle occurred every day).<sup>37</sup> R. Nahman b. Isaac taught this<sup>38</sup> explicitly:<sup>39</sup> Rab ruled, The commandment of the Lulab applies to all seven days.

Our Rabbis taught, He who makes a Sukkah for his own use shall recite the benediction, ‘Blessed art Thou... who has kept us in life, etc.’<sup>40</sup> When he enters to take up his abode in it, he says, ‘Blessed art Thou... who has sanctified us, etc.’<sup>41</sup> If it<sup>42</sup> was already erected,<sup>43</sup> he may recite the benediction if he can make some renovation in it; and if not, he recites two benedictions<sup>40</sup> when he enters to take up his abode in it. R. Ashi stated, I observed that R. Kahana recited all of them over the cup of Sanctification.<sup>44</sup>

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

Our Rabbis taught, He who has to perform many commandments<sup>45</sup> [simultaneously] shall say, 'Blessed... who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments and commanded us concerning the commandments'.<sup>46</sup> R. Judah ruled, One must recite a benediction over each one separately. R. Zera or, as some say, R. Hanina b. Papa stated, The Halachah<sup>47</sup> is in agreement with R. Judah. R. Zera or, as some say, R. Hanina b. Papa further stated, What is the reason of R. Judah? Because it is written, Blessed be the Lord by day.<sup>48</sup> Now do we bless Him by day and not by night?<sup>49</sup> But this comes to teach you: Return to Him every day its appropriate benedictions.<sup>50</sup> So also here: Return unto Him for every single thing, its appropriate benedictions.

R. Zera or, as some say, R. Hanina b. Papa further stated, Come and see that not as the standards of mortal man are the standards of the Holy One, blessed be He. According to the standards of mortal man, an empty vessel

- (1) On the eve of the Festival.
- (2) Not for that of others.
- (3) Pes. 7b.
- (4) Since Rabbah b. Bar Hana ruled that the benediction over the Lulab is recited only on the first day and here it is ruled that it must be recited all the seven days.
- (5) Since he says that the benediction over the Sukkah must be recited all seven days and here it is ruled that it is to be recited on the first day only.
- (6) When, according to R. Johanan, it was a Pentateuchal commandment to take the Lulab every day.
- (7) Whether in the case of a commandment that is performed during a certain length of time the benediction is to be said more than once.
- (8) Though it is one's duty to wear them all day.
- (9) Irrespective of the number of times he takes them off and puts them on again.
- (10) Similarly in the case of Sukkah. Though the seven days are regarded as one long day the benediction must be repeated every day.
- (11) Men. 43a. So also in the case of Sukkah the benediction is recited on the first day only.
- (12) By Amoras.
- (13) That the benediction is to be recited only once.

- (14) After taking off his Tefillin.
- (15) Of the Sukkah.
- (16) Of the Festival.
- (17) Irrespective of the number of times this had happened during the day.
- (18) It is a pious act to touch one's Tefillin as frequently as possible (cf. Yoma 7b).
- (19) Sc. the recital of the benediction over it.
- (20) Since the obligation on that day is Pentateuchal.
- (21) R. Johanan b. Zakkai and his colleagues. Such an ordinance, being only Rabbinical, requires no benediction.
- (22) The ruling of R. Isaac.
- (23) The benedictions must be recited, even though it is only a Rabbinical ordinance.
- (24) During Hanukkah or the Feast of Dedication beginning on the twenty-fifth of Kislev, one lamp is lit on the first night, two on the second, three on the third, and so on, until the eighth night when eight lamps are kindled.
- (25) Even though it is only a Rabbinical institution; and similarly in the case of Lulab.
- (26) While he himself did not light one in his own home.
- (27) V. P.B. p. 274.
- (28) Omitting the first benediction, 'to kindle the light'.
- (29) The first two.
- (30) The second only.
- (31) Since it is not mentioned in the Bible.
- (32) Deut. XVII, 11; even from that which the Rabbis institute, thus giving a Rabbinical commandment Pentateuchal sanction.
- (33) Deut. XXXII, 7.
- (34) After the first day.
- (35) The third, 'Who has kept us alive, etc.'
- (36) The second one.
- (37) The benediction mentioning it cannot, therefore, be omitted. Rashal omits the passage in parenthesis. On the whole passage, v. Shab. 23a.
- (38) Rab's ruling on the Lulab.
- (39) Sc. he did not deduce it, as stated supra, from the law of the Hanukkah light.
- (40) Cf. P.B. p. 232.
- (41) '... to dwell in the Tabernacle' (ibid.).
- (42) The Sukkah.
- (43) For some secular purpose.
- (44) When he recited the Sanctification of the Festival (v. P.B. p. 230f) he recited the two above mentioned benedictions (P.B. p. 232 also. This is our present custom.
- (45) E.g., Sukkah, Lulab, Tefillin and Zizith.
- (46) And there is no need to recite the special benedictions prescribed for each individual commandment.
- (47) [הלכתא] So MS.M.: cur. edd. הלכתא.
- (48) Ps. LXVIII, 20.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

(49) Is He not in fact blessed always.

(50) Those of the Sabbath on a Sabbath and those of a weekday during weekdays.

## Sukkah 46b

is able to contain [what is put into it], and a full vessel cannot contain it<sup>1</sup> but according to the standards of the Holy One, blessed be He, a full vessel is able to contain it<sup>1</sup> While an empty one cannot; as it is said, And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently,<sup>2</sup> if you hearken,<sup>3</sup> you will continue to hearken,<sup>4</sup> but if not, you will not hearken.<sup>5</sup> Another interpretation: If you will hearken to the old,<sup>6</sup> you will be able to hearken to the new,<sup>7</sup> but if thy heart turn away<sup>8</sup> you will no more hearken.<sup>9</sup>

FROM THE HANDS OF THE CHILDREN, etc. R. Johanan ruled, The Ethrog is forbidden<sup>10</sup> on the seventh day,<sup>11</sup> and permitted on the eighth; the Sukkah is forbidden<sup>12</sup> even on the eighth. Resh Lakish, however, ruled that the Ethrog is permitted<sup>10</sup> even on the seventh day.<sup>13</sup> On what principle do they differ? — One Master<sup>14</sup> is of the opinion that it is set aside only for the performance of its commandment,<sup>15</sup> while the other Master<sup>16</sup> is of the opinion that it<sup>17</sup> is set aside for the whole day.<sup>18</sup>

Resh Lakish raised an objection against R. Johanan: **THEY USED<sup>19</sup> TO TAKE THEIR LULABS FROM THE HANDS OF THE CHILDREN AND EAT THEIR ETHROGS.** Does not this equally apply to adults also?<sup>20</sup> — No; it applies to children alone.<sup>21</sup> There are others who say that R. Johanan raised the objection against Resh Lakish: **THEY USED<sup>19</sup> TO TAKE THEIR LULABS FROM THE HANDS OF THE CHILDREN AND EAT THEIR ETHROGS.** [Of] children only, but not [of] adults!<sup>22</sup> — No; the same law applies to [those of] adults also, and the reason that he mentions children is that he states what was customary.<sup>23</sup>

Said R. Papa to Abaye, What, according to R. Johanan, is the essential difference between the Sukkah and the Ethrog?<sup>24</sup> — The other answered him, The Sukkah which is fit to be used at twilight [after the seventh day], for were he perchance to have a meal at that time he would be expected to sit therein and eat there, is set aside for its ritual purpose during the twilight, and since it is set aside during twilight, it is also set aside for the whole of the eighth day; the Ethrog, however, which is not suitable during twilight,<sup>25</sup> is not set aside for its ritual purpose during twilight, hence it is not set aside for the purpose for the whole of the eighth day. Levi, however, ruled, The Ethrog<sup>26</sup> is forbidden even on the eighth day;<sup>27</sup> while the father of Samuel ruled, The Ethrog is forbidden on the seventh day, but permitted on the eighth —

The father of Samuel subsequently adopted the view of Levi. R. Zera, however, adopted the [earlier] view of the father of Samuel, for R. Zera ruled, It is forbidden to eat an Ethrog [even one] that has become invalid, all the seven days.<sup>28</sup> R. Zera ruled, One should not transfer possession<sup>29</sup> of the festive wreath<sup>30</sup> to a child on the first day of the Festival.<sup>31</sup> What is the reason? —

Because a child is<sup>32</sup> entitled to acquire possession but not to transfer it, and the result will be that (the man) would have to perform his duty with a Lulab which is not his.<sup>33</sup> R. Zera further ruled, One should not promise a child to give him something and then not give it to him, because he will thereby teach him lying, as it is said, They have taught their tongues to speak lies.<sup>34</sup> [The following dispute is based on the same principles] as the one between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish.<sup>35</sup> For it was stated, If a man set apart seven Ethrogs for the seven days,<sup>36</sup> Rab ruled, He may fulfill his obligation with each one and eat it forthwith, while R. Assi ruled, He may fulfill his obligation with each one and eat it on the morrow.<sup>37</sup> On what principle do they



# SUCCA – 29b-56b

differ? One Master<sup>38</sup> is of the opinion that it<sup>39</sup> is set apart only for the performance of its rite<sup>40</sup> while the other Master<sup>41</sup> is of the opinion that it<sup>39</sup> is set apart for the whole day. And as for us, who<sup>42</sup> keep two days [of the Festival] how are we to proceed?<sup>43</sup> —

Abaye replied, On the eighth day which may be the seventh, it<sup>44</sup> is forbidden;<sup>45</sup> on the ninth day which may be the eighth, it is permitted. Meremar ruled, Even on the eighth day, which may be the seventh, it is permitted. In Sura they acted in accordance with the ruling of Meremar. R. Shisha the son of R. Idi acted in accordance with the ruling of Abaye. And the law is in agreement with Abaye. R. Judah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath citing Rab ruled, The eighth day which may be the seventh is regarded as the seventh in respect of the Sukkah<sup>46</sup> and as the eighth in respect of the benediction.<sup>47</sup> R. Johanan, however, ruled, It is regarded as the eighth in respect of both.<sup>48</sup> That one must dwell [in the Sukkah on the eighth day] is agreed by all, they only differ

- (1) Sc. anything added to its contents.
- (2) Deut. XXVIII, 1. Lit., 'if hearken, thou wilt hearken', emphasis on the repetition of the verb.
- (3) I.e., if you are in the habit of listening and learning.
- (4) The mind used to hearkening and learning ('a full vessel') will be able to continue to hearken and to gather more knowledge.
- (5) One not used to the discipline of religion and study from his youth is unable to acquire them in later life.
- (6) Sc. revise regularly that which you have already learnt.
- (7) His previous knowledge will serve as a preparation and aid to further knowledge.
- (8) Deut. XXX, 17; neglecting past study and experience.
- (9) Your studies will have no foundation or background.
- (10) To be eaten.
- (11) Even after it had been used for its ritual purpose.
- (12) To be used as fuel.
- (13) After it served its ritual purpose.
- (14) Resh Lakish.

- (15) The moment, therefore, it has served its ritual purpose for the last time on the seventh day, profane use may be made of it.
- (16) R. Johanan.
- (17) Since it still has its sacred use on the seventh day.
- (18) For ordinary purposes, therefore, it may not be used until the eighth day.
- (19) On the seventh day of the Festival.
- (20) Sc. that the adults may eat their own Ethrogs also, which proves that an Ethrog may be eaten on the seventh day.
- (21) Since their Ethrogs were never properly set aside, as is the case with adults, for the ritual purpose. A child is under no obligation to have an Ethrog, and he is given one for the mere purpose of his religious training and practice.
- (22) Cf. prev. note mut. mut.
- (23) The Ethrogs were snatched from the children, not from adults.
- (24) That the former should be forbidden all the seventh day while the latter is permitted.
- (25) After one has duly take it in the morning.
- (26) Since it is doubtful whether the moment of twilight is to be regarded as the conclusion of the one day or as the beginning of the following one, and since the Ethrog was forbidden all the seventh day including twilight which possibly belongs to the eighth day.
- (27) Because what is forbidden at twilight remains forbidden throughout the day.
- (28) But on the eighth day it is permitted.
- (29) As a gift.
- (30) Lit., 'Hoshanna'.
- (31) Unless he himself has already performed the rite.
- (32) In accordance with Rabbinic law.
- (33) Which is invalid (v. supra 29b). Once the man gave it to the child, it becomes the latter's property which, as a minor, he cannot transfer again to him.
- (34) Jer. IX, 4.
- (35) Supra.
- (36) Of the Festival, one for each day.
- (37) Rashal transposes the views of Rab and R. Assi.
- (38) Rab.
- (39) Each Ethrog.
- (40) Hence it may be eaten immediately after the rite had been performed.
- (41) R. Assi.
- (42) Since we are in doubt as to which day is the first.
- (43) Subjecting the two to the same sanctity and restrictions as the first.
- (44) The Ethrog.
- (45) To be eaten.
- (46) As will be explained infra.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(47) Sc. the mention of the day, viz., ‘The Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly’, must be included in the daily prayers, the Grace after meals and the Kiddush.

(48) Sukkah as well as benediction.

## Sukkah 47a

on the question of the benediction.<sup>1</sup> According to him who regards the day as the seventh in respect of the Sukkah, we also recite the benediction [of the Sukkah], while according to him who holds that it is regarded as the eighth in respect of both, we do not recite the benediction [of the Sukkah].<sup>2</sup> R. Joseph observed, Hold fast to the ruling of R. Johanan,<sup>3</sup> since R. Huna b. Bizna and all the notables of his age once entered a Sukkah on the eighth day which may have been the seventh, and while they sat therein, they did not recite the benediction.<sup>4</sup> But is it not possible that they were of the same opinion as he who laid down that once a man has recited the benediction<sup>4</sup> on the first day, he has no more need to recite it?<sup>5</sup> —

There was a tradition that they<sup>6</sup> had just come from the fields.<sup>7</sup> There are some who say that the ruling that one must not recite the benediction [of the Sukkah] is agreed upon by both, and that they only differ on the question whether one must sit [in the Sukkah].<sup>8</sup> According to him who ruled that it is regarded as the seventh day in respect of the Sukkah, we must indeed sit in it thereon, while according to him who ruled that it is regarded as the eighth day in respect of both, we may not even sit in it thereon. R. Joseph observed, Hold fast to the ruling of R. Johanan. For who is the authority of the statement?<sup>9</sup> R. Judah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath [of course], and he himself sat on the eighth day which might be the seventh outside the Sukkah.<sup>10</sup> And the law is that we must indeed sit in the Sukkah but may not recite the benediction. R. Johanan ruled, We recite the benediction of the season<sup>11</sup> on the Eighth Day of the Festival,<sup>12</sup> but we do not

say the benediction of the season on the seventh day of Passover.

[In connection with this] R. Levi b. Hama or, as some say, R. Hama b. Hanina stated, You can have proof that this is so,<sup>13</sup> since [the Eighth Day] is different [from the preceding days] in three respects: In those of Sukkah, Lulab and water libation,<sup>14</sup> and according to R. Judah who maintained that with one log<sup>15</sup> of water they performed the water libation for eight days,<sup>16</sup> it is different at least in two respects. If so, is not the seventh day of Passover also different in respect of the commandment to eat unleavened bread, since a Master has said, On the first night<sup>17</sup> it is an obligation [to eat unleavened bread], and henceforth it is voluntary?<sup>18</sup> —

What a comparison! In the case of Passover, it is different from the first night, but not from the day,<sup>19</sup> whereas in the case of the Eighth Day, it is different even from the preceding day. Rabina replied, The Eighth Day is different from the day immediately preceding it, whereas the seventh day of Passover is different from what is prior [to the period] which precedes it.<sup>20</sup> R. Papa replied,<sup>21</sup> In one case<sup>22</sup> it is written ‘bullock’, in the other<sup>23</sup> ‘bullocks’. R. Nahman b. Isaac replied, In this case<sup>22</sup> it is written, ‘on the day’, in the other,<sup>23</sup> ‘and on the day’. R. Ashi replied, In the case of the Eighth Day it is written, ‘According to the ordinance’ while in the case of the seventh day it is written, ‘according to their ordinance’.

Can we say that [the following statement] supports [the view of R. Johanan]:<sup>24</sup> The bullocks, the rams and the lambs<sup>25</sup> act as a hindrance to one another,<sup>26</sup> while R. Judah ruled, The bullocks do not act as a hindrance to one another, since they diminish in number progressively.<sup>27</sup> They<sup>28</sup> said to him, But are not all of them<sup>29</sup> diminished in number on the Eighth Day?<sup>30</sup> He answered them, The Eighth Day is a

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

separate festival,<sup>31</sup> for, just as the seven days of the Festival must have [their own] sacrifices, psalm,<sup>32</sup> benediction<sup>33</sup> and staying overnight,<sup>34</sup> so the Eighth Day must have its own sacrifices, psalm,<sup>35</sup> benediction<sup>33</sup> and staying overnight.

- (1) 'Blessed art Thou... to sit in the Sukkah'.
- (2) Thus it is the eighth 'in respect of Sukkah' in that the benediction of the Sukkah is not recited, and it is the eighth 'in respect of the benediction', in that we mention the 'Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly'.
- (3) That the benediction of the Sukkah is not to be said on the eighth which may be the seventh.
- (4) Of the Sukkah.
- (5) On any of the other days of the Festival.
- (6) R. Huna b. Bizna and the others.
- (7) Or 'pasture land', where they looked after their cattle since the beginning of the Festival and, therefore, had not yet sat in a Sukkah during that Festival.
- (8) On the eighth day.
- (9) Cited in the name of Rab supra.
- (10) Which proves that he did not rely upon the tradition he cited.
- (11) The benediction, 'Blessed... who hast kept us in life... to reach this season' (cf. P.B. p. 231) which is said only on the first day of a festival. R. Johanan regards the eighth day as a separate festival.
- (12) The Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, which is regarded as a festival distinct from that of Tabernacles.
- (13) That the Eighth Day is a festival of its own.
- (14) None of which obtains on the Eighth Day.
- (15) Not, as the first Tanna stated, with three logs.
- (16) Infra 48b; and only for the seven days.
- (17) Of Passover.
- (18) Pes. 120a.
- (19) Since even on the first day of Passover the eating of unleavened bread is voluntary.
- (20) The first night.
- (21) The next three statements point out that in the section dealing with the sacrifices of the festival, Num. XXIX, 12-39, there are differences between the first seven days, and the Eighth Day either in respect of the laws of the sacrifices or the expressions used in connection with them; proving that the latter is a separate festival. These differences are that (a) on each of the seven days a number of bullocks were sacrificed while on the Eighth Day only one was offered (v. 36). (b) the descriptions of the sacrifices of the second to the seventh day begin with the word 'and' ('And on the day') suggesting continuity, while that of the Eighth

Day commences 'On the eighth day' omitting the 'and', (c) on the seventh day it was 'According to their ordinance', connecting it with the previous days whereas the Eighth Day has, 'according to the ordinance'.

- (22) The Eighth Day.
- (23) The first seven days.
- (24) That the benediction of the season is to be said on the Eighth Day.
- (25) Prescribed as sacrifices for the days of Tabernacles.
- (26) The omission of one of them invalidates the whole number.
- (27) Thirteen on the first day and one less every day (v. Num. XXIX). As the number is in any case steadily diminished, the additional omission of one or more cannot affect the remainder.
- (28) The Rabbis who differed from him.
- (29) Even the rams and lambs.
- (30) Of course they are: On the seven days of the festival the number of rams and he-lambs remains constant at two and fourteen respectively, while on the Eighth Day only one ram and seven he-lambs were offered (cf. Num. XXIX, 36). Why then should the omission of one of these more than the omission of a bullock affect the remainder?
- (31) Its sacrifices cannot, therefore, like those of any of the seven days, be compared to the others.
- (32) Ps. XCIV, sung by the Levites when the sacrifice was offered (v. infra 55a).
- (33) This is explained infra.
- (34) The duty of remaining in Jerusalem for the night following the festival, mentioned in the case of the Passover (Deut. XVI, 7) is adduced to apply to all festivals (cf. R.H. 5a).
- (35) According to Soferim XIX, 2, it was Ps. VI.

## Sukkah 47b

Now does not ['benediction' refer to the benediction of the] season?<sup>1</sup> —

No, it refers to the Grace after meals and to Prayer.<sup>2</sup> It is also in accordance with reason to say so, for if you were to imagine that [the reference is to the benediction of] the season, do we then [it could be objected] recite the benediction of the season during all the seven days?<sup>3</sup> —

This really presents no difficulty, for if a man did not recite the benediction [of the season] during the first day, he has to recite it on the morrow, or on any subsequent

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

day.<sup>4</sup> But, in any case, must not the benediction [of the season] be recited over a cup [of wine]?<sup>5</sup> Must we then say that this supports the view of R. Nahman,<sup>7</sup> for R. Nahman laid down [that the benediction of the] season may be recited even in the market-place?<sup>8</sup> For if you will say that the cup [of wine] is essential, has one then a cup [of wine] every day? —

This might apply to a case where one chanced to have a cup [of wine]. Is then R. Judah of the opinion that on the Eighth Day there must be staying overnight? Has it not in fact been taught: R. Judah stated, Whence do we know that the Second Passover<sup>9</sup> does not need staying overnight? From what was said, And thou shalt turn in the morning and go into thy tents<sup>10</sup> and [immediately afterwards] it is written, Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread,<sup>11</sup> thus implying that that which must have six days [of observance]<sup>12</sup> must have staying overnight, but that which does not need six days [of observance]<sup>13</sup> does not need staying overnight. Now is not this<sup>14</sup> to exclude also the Eighth Day of the festival? —

No, to exclude only the Second Passover which is similar to it.<sup>15</sup> It is also in accordance with reason to say so,<sup>16</sup> for we have learnt, The Bikkurim<sup>17</sup> require a sacrifice, a psalm,<sup>18</sup> waving<sup>19</sup> and staying overnight.<sup>20</sup> Now who is it that has been heard to say that they require waving? R. Judah of course, and it states that they<sup>21</sup> require staying overnight.<sup>22</sup> For it has been taught,<sup>23</sup> And thou shalt set it down<sup>24</sup> refers to the waving. You say that it refers to the waving but perhaps it means literally ‘setting it down’? As it says [subsequently], And set it down,<sup>25</sup> ‘setting down,’ surely, is mentioned, to what then do I apply the verse, ‘and thou shalt set it down’? To waving.<sup>26</sup>

[This Mishnah],<sup>27</sup> however, might concur with R. Eliezer b. Jacob,<sup>28</sup> for it has been taught, And the priest shall take the basket

out of thy hand<sup>29</sup> teaches<sup>30</sup> that Bikkurim require waving; these are the words of R. Eliezer b. Jacob. What is the reason of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? He deduces it from the word ‘hand’ occurring here and in the case of the peace-offering. Here it is written, ‘And the priest shall take the basket out of thy hand’,<sup>29</sup> and there it is written, His own hands shall bring the offering unto the Lord,<sup>31</sup> just as here the priest [takes it and waves it] so there the priest [takes it and waves it], and just as there the owner [brings and waves it] so here also the owner [brings and waves it]. How is this possible?<sup>32</sup> The priest places his hand under the hand of the owner and waves it.<sup>33</sup> What is the ultimate decision?<sup>34</sup>—

R. Nahman ruled, We say [the benediction of the] season on the Eighth Day of the Festival, while R. Shesheth ruled, We do not say [the benediction of the] season on the Eighth Day of the Festival. And the law is that we say [the benediction of the] season on the Eighth Day of the Festival. It has been taught in agreement with R. Nahman, The Eighth Day

- (1) Which shows, does it not, that in agreement with R. Johanan, the benediction of the season must be said on the Eighth Day?
- (2) Instead of saying ‘this Festival of Tabernacles’, as is done during the seven days, one says, ‘this Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly’ (cf. P.B. pp. 282 and 228). The Tosefta (IV, 17) says that this refers to the blessing of the king, in accordance with I Kings VIII, 66.
- (3) Of course not. It is said only on the first day.
- (4) ‘Benediction’ may, therefore, apply to that of the season.
- (5) And not every one has always wine on the intermediate days of a festival.
- (6) The assumption that ‘benediction’ refers to that of the season and that it may be said on any of the intermediate days when not every one can afford wine.
- (7) That the cup of wine is not essential for the benediction?
- (8) Without wine.
- (9) Which was kept by those who were unable to keep the Passover proper owing to ritual uncleanness or absence (cf. Num. IX, 6 14).
- (10) Deut. XVI, 7.
- (11) Ibid. 8.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (12) Sc. the Passover proper.  
(13) The Second Passover which is kept on the fourteenth of Iyar only.  
(14) The deduction of R. Judah which seems to lay down a general rule.  
(15) [I.e., to the celebration spoken of in the context Deut. XVI, 7-8. Var. lec., however, omit 'which is similar to it'. R. Judah was thus referring only to the Second Passover, and did not lay down a general rule].  
(16) That R. Judah excludes the Second Passover only.  
(17) First fruits (v. Deut. XXVI, 1ff), when taken up to Jerusalem.  
(18) Ps. XXX.  
(19) This is discussed infra.  
(20) Bik. II, 4.  
(21) Bikkurim.  
(22) Though the ceremony does not last for six days, which shows that only the Second Passover has been excluded.  
(23) Proof is now adduced that R. Judah requires Bikkurim to be waved.  
(24) Deut. XXVI, 10.  
(25) Deut. XXVI, 4. For variant in order of verses quoted v. Mak., Sonc. ed., p. 130, n. 7.  
(26) Mak. 18b.  
(27) Which requires 'waving' and 'staying overnight' in the case of Bikkurim.  
(28) And not with R. Judah who may be maintaining that whatever rite lasts for less than six days requires neither the one nor the other.  
(29) Deut. XXVI, 4.  
(30) Since it says 'Out of thy hand'.  
(31) Lev. VII, 30.  
(32) For both the priest and the owner to perform the waving.  
(33) Mak. 18b. Thus it has been shown that the Mishnah Bik. II, 4, may represent the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob; and consequently no support may be adduced from it to the view that R. Judah excludes the Second Passover only.  
(34) On the question of the benediction of the season on the Eighth Day.

## Sukkah 48a

is a Separate festival with regard to P'Z'R' K'SH'B'<sup>1</sup> i.e., with regard to balloting it is a separate festival,<sup>2</sup> with regard to the benediction of the season it is a separate festival,<sup>3</sup> with regard to the nature of the festival it is a separate festival,<sup>4</sup> with regard to its sacrifice it is a separate festival,<sup>5</sup> with regard to its psalm it is a separate festival,<sup>3</sup> and with regard to its benediction it is a separate festival.<sup>3</sup>

*MISHNAH.* 'THE HALLEL [WAS RECITED] AND THE [PEACE-OFFERINGS OF] REJOICING [WERE OFFERED] ON ALL THE EIGHT DAYS' — HOW IS THAT? THIS TEACHES THAT ONE IS BOUND TO RECITE THE HALLEL, [OFFER PEACE-OFFERINGS OF] REJOICING AND SHOW HONOR TO THE FESTIVAL ON THE LAST DAY, AS ON ALL THE OTHER DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL.

*GEMARA.* Whence do we know this?<sup>6</sup> — From what our Rabbis taught, [The verse], And thou shalt be altogether joyful<sup>7</sup> includes<sup>8</sup> the night of the last day of the Festival.<sup>9</sup> But perhaps this is not so, but the text was meant to include [the night of] the first day of the Festival?<sup>10</sup> As it says, ak<sup>11</sup> a division is indicated.<sup>12</sup> But why have you seen fit to include the last night of the Festival and to exclude the first night? I include the last night since it is preceded by rejoicing<sup>13</sup> and exclude the first night which is not preceded by rejoicing.

*MISHNAH.* THE SUKKAH [MUST BE USED ALL] SEVEN DAYS. HOW IS THIS [TO BE UNDERSTOOD]? WHEN A MAN HAS FINISHED HIS [LAST] MEAL,<sup>14</sup> HE MAY NOT DISMANTLE HIS SUKKAH.<sup>15</sup> HE MAY, HOWEVER, REMOVE ITS FURNITURE<sup>16</sup> FROM THE AFTERNOON ONWARDS IN HONOR OF THE LAST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL.<sup>17</sup>

*GEMARA.* If a man has no FURNITURE to remove,<sup>18</sup> what shall he do? 'If a man has no FURNITURE'! What then did he use when he was using [his Sukkah]? — Rather say, If he had no place where to put his furniture<sup>19</sup> what shall he do?<sup>20</sup> — R. Hiyya b. Ashi<sup>21</sup> answered, He removes four handbreadths [of its roof],<sup>22</sup> while R. Joshua b. Levi answered, he should kindle a lamp in it.<sup>23</sup> In fact, however, there is no difference of opinion between them, the latter referring to us [Babylonians], and the former to them [the Palestinians].<sup>24</sup> This<sup>25</sup> is

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

a satisfactory procedure with regard to a Sukkah of minimum size<sup>26</sup> but what can be said with regard to a large Sukkah?<sup>27</sup> — One might carry into it eating utensils, since Raba ruled, Eating utensils must be kept outside the Sukkah; drinking vessels in the Sukkah.<sup>28</sup>

**MISHNAH.** HOW WAS THE WATER LIBATION [PERFORMED]? A GOLDEN FLAGON HOLDING THREE LOGS WAS FILLED FROM THE SILOAM.<sup>29</sup> WHEN THEY ARRIVED AT THE WATER GATE,<sup>30</sup> THEY SOUNDED A TEK'AH [LONG BLAST], A TERU'AH [TREMULOUS NOTE] AND AGAIN A TEK'AH [LONG BLAST]. [THE PRIEST THEN] WENT UP THE ASCENT [OF THE ALTAR]<sup>31</sup> AND TURNED TO HIS LEFT<sup>32</sup> WHERE THERE WERE TWO SILVER BOWLS. R. JUDAH SAID, THEY WERE OF PLASTER [BUT THEY LOOKED SILVER] BECAUSE THEIR SURFACES WERE DARKENED FROM THE WINE. THEY HAD EACH A HOLE

(1) A mnemonic acrostic formed by the initial letters of פייס 'balloting', זמן 'season', רגל 'festival', קרבן 'sacrifice', שיר 'psalm', ברכה 'benediction'.

(2) There were so many sacrifices on the first seven days, that the balloting for duty among the courses of priests was unnecessary. On the Eighth Day there was but one bullock offered and it was balloted for (cf. infra 55b).

(3) As stated supra.

(4) That it is unnecessary to dwell on it in the Sukkah.

(5) The number of bullocks offered is not six as might have been expected if the sixth day had been regarded as the eighth of the days of Tabernacles on each of which the number of bullocks was reduced by one.

(6) That the duty of rejoicing prescribed for the seven days of the Festival applies to the Eighth Day also.

(7) Deut. XVI, 15.

(8) Since 'joyful' is superfluous, the duty of rejoicing having been mentioned earlier in the context.

(9) Sc. one must include the night belonging to the Eighth Day and following the seventh in the rejoicings of the concluding day, i.e., the number of sacrifices on the seventh day must be such as to suffice for the night following; and

since the night is included much more so the day that follows since the time for offerings is the day-time.

(10) Sc. that offerings must be brought on the eve of the first day of the Festival in order to provide for the first evening when no offering may be brought.

(11) Lit., 'but', 'only'; E.V., 'altogether'.

(12) Implying a limitation, v. Pes. 5a.

(13) Of the concluding day.

(14) On the seventh day.

(15) Since he must still use it for learning, sleeping or any occasional meal on that day.

(16) From the Sukkah into the house where he is to have his meals in the evening and the following day.

(17) For the rejoicings of which the house has to be prepared.

(18) V. supra n. 4.

(19) I.e., he had nowhere else to eat.

(20) To indicate that he is not using his Sukkah for more than the prescribed seven days.

(21) So Asheri. Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'Rab'.

(22) Thus invalidating it and showing that it is no longer in use.

(23) By doing in it that which is forbidden in a Sukkah (cf. supra 29a) he indicates that it is no longer in use as a Sukkah but as an ordinary hut.

(24) In Babylon where the proper calculations of the calendar are unknown, the Eighth Day may be the seventh, and the Sukkah must, therefore, be used on the morrow. It cannot be invalidated by a breach in its roof so one places there a lamp which can subsequently be removed. The Palestinians, however, who are familiar with the calculations, make no more use of the Sukkah after the seventh day, and it may, therefore, be invalidated on that day.

(25) The kindling of the lamp.

(26) Into which no lamp may be brought during the seven days of the Festival (cf. supra 29a).

(27) Where a lamp may be taken in even during the seven days.

(28) Ibid.

(29) A pool near Jerusalem.

(30) One of the gates of the Temple court.

(31) Which was on the south (Mid. III, 3).

(32) Towards the south-west of the altar where the water libations were offered.

## Sukkah 48b

LIKE A SLENDER SNOUT,<sup>1</sup> ONE [HOLE] BEING WIDE AND THE OTHER NARROW SO THAT BOTH EMPTIED THEMSELVES<sup>2</sup> TOGETHER.<sup>3</sup> THE ONE ON THE WEST WAS FOR WATER AND THE ONE<sup>4</sup> ON THE EAST

## SUCAH – 29b-56b

FOR WINE. IF ONE Poured the flagon of water into the bowl for wine, or that of wine into that for water, he has fulfilled his obligation. R. Judah stated, with one log<sup>5</sup> he performed the ceremony of the water-libation all eight<sup>6</sup> days. To [the priest] who performed the libation they used to say, 'raise thy hand';<sup>7</sup> for on a certain occasion, a certain man<sup>8</sup> poured out the water over his feet, and all the people pelted him with their ethrogs. As was its performance on weekdays, so was its performance on the Sabbath, save that on the eve of the Sabbath an unhallowed<sup>9</sup> golden barrel was filled from the siloam, and placed in a chamber. If it was poured away or uncovered, it was refilled from the laver,<sup>10</sup> for wine or water which has become uncovered is invalid for the altar.

*GEMARA.* Whence do we know this?<sup>11</sup> — R. Ena replied, From Scripture which says, Therefore with joy shall ye draw water [from the wells of salvation].<sup>12</sup> There were once two minim,<sup>13</sup> one was called Sason<sup>14</sup> and the other Simha.<sup>15</sup> Said Sason to Simha, 'I am better than you, since it is written, They shall obtain Sason and Simha'.<sup>16</sup> 'I', said Simha to Sason, 'am better than you, since it is written, The Jews had Simha and Sason'.<sup>17</sup> 'One day', said Sason to Simha, 'they will take you out<sup>18</sup> and make you a runner, since it is written, For with Simha shall they go forth'.<sup>19</sup> 'One day', said Simha to Sason, 'they will take you out<sup>18</sup> and draw with you water, for it is written, "Therefore with Sason shall ye draw water"'.<sup>12</sup> A certain min<sup>20</sup> whose name was Sason once said to R. Abbahu, 'You are destined to draw water for me in the world to come, for it is written, "Therefore be-sason shall ye draw water"'.<sup>21</sup> 'If', the other retorted, 'it had

been written, "le-sason"<sup>22</sup> it would be as you say, but as it is written "be-sason"<sup>23</sup> the meaning must be that a water-skin will be made of your skin, and water will be drawn with it'.

[THE PRIEST] WENT UP THE ASCENT [OF THE ALTAR] AND TURNED TO HIS LEFT, etc. Our Rabbis have taught, All who ascended the altar turned to the right, proceeded round and descended by the left,<sup>24</sup> save those ascending for the following three purposes,<sup>25</sup> who ascended by the left,<sup>26</sup> turned on their heel<sup>27</sup> and returned [the same way]. These [three things] are the water-libation and wine-libation, and the burnt-offering of a fowl when the altar was full on [its south] east side.<sup>28</sup>

[BUT THEY LOOKED SILVER] BECAUSE THEIR SURFACES WERE DARKENED. It is well [as regards the flagon of the wine] since wine darkens, but how was that of the water darkened? — Since the Master has said, IF ONE Poured the flagon of water into the bowl for wine, or that of wine into that for water, he has fulfilled his obligation, the [flagon] of water may<sup>29</sup> thus become darkened.

THEY HAD EACH A HOLE LIKE A SLENDER SNOOT, etc. Must we say that our Mishnah<sup>30</sup> agrees with R. Judah and not with the Rabbis seeing that we have learnt, R. JUDAH STATED, WITH ONE LOG HE PERFORMED THE CEREMONY OF THE WATER-LIBATION ALL EIGHT DAYS;<sup>31</sup> for if it agrees with the Rabbis, could they not both pour together?<sup>32</sup> — [No,] You may say that it agrees even with the Rabbis, [the reason for the different sizes of the holes being that] wine is viscous and water is fluid. It is in accordance with reason also to say so,<sup>33</sup> for if [our Mishnah concurs with] R. Judah, [it should have used the terms] 'broad' and 'strait' which he used;<sup>34</sup> as it has been

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

taught, R. Judah stated, There were two vessels there, one of water and one of wine, the mouth of the wine [vessel] was broad, and that of the water was strait, so that both should empty themselves together. This is conclusive.

**THE ONE ON THE WEST WAS FOR WATER.** Our Rabbis taught, It once happened that a certain Sadducee<sup>35</sup> poured the water libation over his feet and all the people pelted him with their Ethrogs. On that day the horn of the altar became damaged,<sup>36</sup> and a handful of salt was brought and it was stopped up, not because the altar was thereby rendered valid for the service, but merely in order that it should not appear damaged

- (1) Sc. each bowl had a perforated spout.
- (2) On the altar, through a hole in which the water ran down to the deep altar ditches.
- (3) This is explained in the Gemara.
- (4) Adjacent to it.
- (5) Not, as the first Tanna stated, three.
- (6) And not, as the first Tanna asserted, seven.
- (7) That all may see that the water is poured into the bowl.
- (8) A Sadducee. Josephus, Ant. XIII, 13, 5, ascribes the incident to Alexander Jannai, king and High Priest 107-76 B.C.E. The Sadducees denied the validity of this precept and in this way he showed his contempt of the Pharisees.
- (9) Since anything which remains in a hallowed vessel overnight becomes invalid (cf. Men. VII, 4).
- (10) Cf. Ex. XXX, 18. Though a hallowed vessel, it did not cause the water in it to be invalid because it was sunk in a cistern on the festival eve (cf. Yoma 37a).
- (11) That the Shofar is sounded at the ceremony (Rashi). That the water was taken from Siloam (Tosaf.). According to Rashi, the answer is in the word 'joy', according to Tosaf. in the words 'from the wells of salvation'.
- (12) Isa. XII, 3.
- (13) 'Sectarians', 'apostates' or 'Jewish Christians'. V. Glos., s.v. Min.
- (14) Meaning 'joy'.
- (15) 'Gladness'.
- (16) Isa. XXXV, 10; 'joy' before 'gladness'.
- (17) Esth. VIII, 17.
- (18) From heaven.
- (19) Isa. LV, 12.
- (20) Cf. n. 5.

- (21) Isa. XII, 3.
- (22) 'For joy'.
- (23) 'With joy'.
- (24) The ascent was on the south, and on reaching the altar one turned to the right, to the south-east corner, to perform the sacrifice. Since it was obligatory to make right-hand turns one could not return by the same way but had to make a complete circuit of the altar and descend by the western side of the descent.
- (25) Which took place at the south-west corner of the altar.
- (26) And (cf. prev. n.) immediately turned towards the south-west. They could not turn to the right to make a circuit round the altar for reasons explained in Zeb. 64a.
- (27) Which meant turning to the right.
- (28) Where normally this sacrifice was done. (Cf. Lev. I, 16, Tamid I, 4).
- (29) Since wine may sometimes be poured into it.
- (30) Which prescribes one hole to be wide and the other narrow.
- (31) The wine was the fourth of a Hin (Num. XXVIII, 7) equivalent to three logs. This would explain the necessity for having a larger aperture in the wine flagon, since there was three times as much wine.
- (32) Since each was three logs.
- (33) That our Mishnah is in agreement with the Rabbis.
- (34) קצר-רהב instead of מיעובה 'WIDE' and דק 'NARROW'. The difference between broad and strait is larger than that between wide and narrow (Rashi).
- (35) V. supra p. 226, n. 15.
- (36) On account of some hard missiles that caught it.

## Sukkah 49a

for<sup>1</sup> an altar which has not the ascent, the horn,<sup>2</sup> the base<sup>3</sup> and the square shape<sup>4</sup> is invalid for the service. R. Jose b. Judah adds, Also the circuit.<sup>5</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hana citing R. Johanan stated, The Pits<sup>6</sup> have existed<sup>7</sup> since the Six days of creation,<sup>8</sup> for it is said, The roundings of thy thighs are like the links of a chain the work of the hands of a skilled workman.<sup>9</sup> 'The rounding<sup>10</sup> of thy thighs' refers to the Pits; 'like the links<sup>11</sup> of a chain' implies that their cavity<sup>12</sup> descends to the abyss; 'the work of the hands of a skilled workman' means that they are the skillful handiwork of the Holy One, blessed be He.



# SUCCA – 29b-56b

The school of R. Ishmael taught: Bereshith;<sup>13</sup> read not Bereshith but Bara Shith.<sup>14</sup>

It has been taught, R. Jose says, The cavity of the Pits descended to the abyss, for it is said, Let me sing of my well-beloved, a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved had a vineyard on a very fruitful hill.<sup>15</sup> And he dugged it, and cleared it of stones, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also hewed out a vat therein.<sup>16</sup> ‘And planted it with the choicest vine’, refers to the Temple; ‘and built a tower in the midst of it’, refers to the altar; ‘and also hewed out a vat therein’, refers to the Pits.<sup>17</sup>

It has been taught, R. Eleazar b. Zadok stated, There was a small passage-way between the ascent and the altar,<sup>18</sup> on the westward of the ascent, and once in seventy years the young<sup>19</sup> of the priesthood used to descend there<sup>20</sup> and gather up therefrom the congealed wine which had the appearance of rounds of pressed figs, and proceeded to burn it in a state of sanctity<sup>21</sup> as it is said, In the holy place shalt thou pour out a drink-offering of strong drink unto the Lord,<sup>22</sup>

- (1) The reason why it was unfit for service.
- (2) A stone of one cubic cubit at each of the four corners.
- (3) A ledge of one cubit in width and one cubit in height from the ground round the altar.
- (4) Cf. Ex. XXVII, 1.
- (5) V. Mid. III, 1. Its absence also invalidates the altar. Cf. Zeb. 62a.
- (6) ‘Shithin’, the pits under the altar into which the wine flowed after the libation.
- (7) Lit., ‘were created’.
- (8) I.e., they were a natural formation.
- (9) Cant. VII, 2.
- (10) Of the rt. Hamak ‘hidden’, ‘covered up’.
- (11) From Hala.
- (12) From Halal, similar (cf. prev. n.) to Hala.
- (13) ‘In the beginning’, Gen. I, 1.
- (14) ‘He created the pit’ (of the altar).
- (15) Palestine.
- (16) Isa. V, 1 and 2.
- (17) Tosef. Sukkah III, 15.

(18) [The ascent did not adjoin closely the altar at the top, but was removed from it by two cubits].

(19) Lit., ‘flowers’.

(20) The cavity through which the wine passed was fenced up along four sides, forming a vat reaching to the marble floor of the court (not as the Rabbis maintain, to the abyss).

(21) Sc. in a holy place in the Temple.

(22) Num. XXVIII, 7.

## Sukkah 49b

just as its libation was done in sanctity, so must its burning be done in sanctity.<sup>1</sup> But what is the proof?<sup>2</sup> —

Rabina answered, An analogy is made between two expressions of ‘holy’. It is written here, ‘In the holy place shalt thou pour out a drink-offering of strong drink unto the Lord’, and it is written elsewhere, Then shalt thou burn the remainder with fire, it shall not be eaten, because it is holy.<sup>3</sup> Whose view is followed in what we learned,<sup>4</sup> ‘The law of sacrileges applies to drink-offerings at the beginning,<sup>6</sup> but after they have descended into the Pits,<sup>7</sup> the law of sacrilege does not apply to them?’<sup>8</sup> Must we say<sup>9</sup> that it is that of R. Eleazar b. Zadok,<sup>10</sup> for if it were that of the Rabbis [the objection could be raised: Did they not state] that the Pits descended to the abyss?<sup>11</sup> You may even say that it is that of the Rabbis, [but it refers to] where it was collected.<sup>12</sup> There are some who read: Must we say that<sup>13</sup> it is that of the Rabbis,<sup>14</sup> and not that of R. Eleazar b. Zadok, for if it were that of R. Eleazar b. Zadok, [the objection would arise:] Do they not<sup>15</sup> still retain their hallowed character?<sup>16</sup> — You may even say that it is that of R. Eleazar, for sacrilege cannot apply to anything whose commandment has already been fulfilled.<sup>17</sup>

Resh Lakish stated, When the wine-libation was poured upon the altar, the Pits were stopped up,<sup>18</sup> in order to fulfill what is written, ‘In holiness shalt thou pour out a

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

drink-offering of strong drink unto the Lord'.<sup>19</sup> But how does this imply it? —

R. Papa answered, Shekar<sup>20</sup> is an expression suggestive of drink, satiety and plenty. From this it may be inferred, R. Papa observed that when a man has his fill of wine, it is due to his filling of his throat.<sup>21</sup> Raba remarked, A young scholar who has not much wine should swallow it in quaffs.<sup>22</sup> Raba used to gulp down the cup of benediction.<sup>23</sup>

Raba made the following exposition: What is the implication of what was written, How beautiful are thy steps in sandals, O prince's daughter?<sup>24</sup> How beautiful are the steps of Israel when they go up [to Jerusalem] to celebrate a festival. 'O prince's daughter', means, daughter of our father Abraham, who is called prince, as it is said, The princes of the peoples are gathered together, the people of the God of Abraham.<sup>25</sup> 'The God of Abraham'! And not the God of Isaac and Jacob? But the meaning is, The God of Abraham who was the first of proselytes.<sup>26</sup>

The School of R. Anan taught: It is written,<sup>27</sup> The roundings of thy thighs.<sup>28</sup> Why are the words of the Torah compared to the thigh? To teach you that just as the thigh is hidden, so should the words of the Torah be hidden,<sup>29</sup> and this is the import of what R. Eleazar said, What is the implication of the text, It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee: Only to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?<sup>30</sup> 'To do justly' means [to act in accordance with] justice; 'to love mercy' refers to acts of loving kindness<sup>31</sup> 'and to walk<sup>32</sup> humbly with thy God' refers to attending to funerals and dowering a bride for her wedding.<sup>33</sup> Now can we not make a deduction a fortiori: If in matters which are normally performed publicly<sup>34</sup> the Torah enjoins 'to walk

humbly', how much more so in matters that are normally done privately?<sup>35</sup>

R. Eleazar stated, Greater is he who performs charity than [he who offers] all the sacrifices, for it is said, To do charity<sup>36</sup> and justice is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice.<sup>37</sup>

R. Eleazar further stated, Gemiluth Hasadim<sup>38</sup> is greater than charity, for it is said, Sow to yourselves according to your charity, but reap according to your hesed;<sup>39</sup> if a man sows, it is doubtful whether he will eat [the harvest] or not, but when a man reaps, he will certainly eat.

R. Eleazar further stated, The reward of charity depends entirely upon the extent of the kindness in it,<sup>40</sup> for it is said, 'Sow to yourselves according to charity, but reap according to the kindness'.

Our Rabbis taught, In three respects is Gemiluth Hasadim superior to charity: charity can be done only with one's money, but Gemiluth Hasadim can be done with one's person and one's money. Charity can be given only to the poor, Gemiluth Hasadim both to the rich and the poor. Charity can be given to the living only, Gemiluth Hasadim can be done both to the living and to the dead.<sup>41</sup>

R. Eleazar further stated, He who executes charity and justice is regarded as though he had filled all the world with kindness, for it is said, He loveth charity and justice, the earth is full of the lovingkindness of the Lord.<sup>42</sup> But lest you say that whoever wishes to do good succeeds without difficulty,<sup>43</sup> Scripture expressly says, How precious is Thy lovingkindness, O God, etc.<sup>44</sup> As<sup>45</sup> one might say that this applies also to a man who fears God,<sup>46</sup> Scripture expressly says, But the lovingkindness of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him.<sup>47</sup>

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

R. Hama b. Papa stated, Every man who is endowed with grace<sup>48</sup> is without doubt a God-fearing man, for it is said, 'But the lovingkindness of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting to them that fear Him.' R. Eleazar further stated, What is the purport of what was written, She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and the Torah of lovingkindness is on her tongue?<sup>49</sup> Is there then a Torah of lovingkindness and a Torah which is not of lovingkindness? But the fact is that Torah [which is studied] for its own sake is a 'Torah of lovingkindness', whereas Torah [which is studied] for an ulterior motive is a Torah which is not of lovingkindness. Some there are who say, Torah [which is studied] in order [subsequently] to teach it is a 'Torah of lovingkindness', but Torah [which is] not [studied subsequently] to teach it is a Torah which is not of lovingkindness.

AS WAS ITS PERFORMANCE ON WEEKDAYS, etc. But why [bring the water in an UNHALLOWED vessel]? let him bring it in a hallowed one?<sup>50</sup> — Ze'iri replied, [The author of our Mishnah] is of the opinion that no fixed amount has been prescribed for the water [of libation] and that vessels of ministry hallow their contents even if there was no intention.

- (1) Tosef Me'il. I, 16.
- (2) That the text refers to burning. No proof is expected for the periodical cleaning of the Pits, since it is obvious that the wine could not be allowed to accumulate there for ever.
- (3) Ex. XXIX, 34; as the latter expression of 'holy' applies to burning, so also does the former.
- (4) Cur. edd. in parenthesis 'was taught'.
- (5) Necessitating a trespass-offering (cf. Lev. V, 15).
- (6) I.e., from the time they were consecrated until libation, since during all this time they are consecrated for the altar.
- (7) When they are no longer suitable for the altar.
- (8) V. Me'il. 11a.
- (9) Since it was necessary to state that the law of sacrilege does not apply to them.

- (10) Who holds that the Pits reached only to the floor of the court and that the wine poured into them was retrievable.
- (11) No law, surely, is required for an object that is for ever lost in the abyss.
- (12) By the suspension of a vessel in the Pit.
- (13) Since the law of trespass does not apply to them after they descended into the Pits.
- (14) The case being one where the drink-offerings were intercepted in the Pits.
- (15) Since he ruled that they are to be burnt in a holy place.
- (16) Why then should not the law of sacrilege still apply?
- (17) The act of libation is regarded as the completion of the commandment.
- (18) So that the wine should not run away immediately and the hole present the sight of a throat full of 'drink, satiety and plenty'.
- (19) Num. XXVIII, 7.
- (20) E.V., 'strong drink'.
- (21) By swallowing large mouthfuls, and not by taking small draughts however large the total quantity consumed.
- (22) Since thereby (cf. prev. n.) he has the same satisfaction as if he drank much wine.
- (23) To show his love of the precept. [The text appears in slight disorder. MS.M. reads: 'A young scholar who has no wine in excess of the cup of benediction should gulp it down'.]
- (24) Cant. VII, 2.
- (25) Ps. XLVII, 10.
- (26) At that time God was only his and not Isaac's or Jacob's.
- (27) Lit., 'what (means) that which is written'.
- (28) This is a continuation of Cant. VII, 2.
- (29) It should be taught in privacy, not in the market place (cf. M.K. 16a).
- (30) Mic. VI, 8.
- (31) Gemiluth Hasadim (v. infra). It is wider than charity including as it does all acts of kindness.
- (32) Emphasis on 'walk'.
- (33) One's help in such cases should be given humbly and in privacy.
- (34) Weddings and funerals.
- (35) The giving of alms.
- (36) Zedakah. E.V. 'righteousness'.
- (37) Prov. XXI, 3.
- (38) Translated 'the practice of kindness' (v. infra).
- (39) Hos. X, 12; the last work signifying Gemiluth Hasadim.
- (40) [I.e., the grace, gentleness and sympathy that accompany the act of charity].
- (41) By attending to their funeral and burial.
- (42) Ps. XXXIII, 5.
- (43) Lit., 'that whoever wishes to leap may leap'.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

(44) Ps. XXXVI, 8; i.e., the opportunity of doing real, well-deserved charity and dispensing it in a judicious manner, is rare (Rashi).

(45) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, ‘the earth is full of the lovingkindness of the Lord’.

(46) Sc. that he also has difficulties in executing charity and justice.

(47) Ps. CIII, 17. Those that truly fear God find lovingkindness easily.

(48) Var. lec., ‘lovingkindness’.

(49) Prov. XXXI, 26.

(50) The questioner assumes that a vessel of ministry does not hallow its contents unless there is that intention, and that it does not hallow it unless it corresponds to the specific amount prescribed for that particular rite. In this case the water has neither of these desiderata.

## Sukkah 50a

If, therefore, it were brought in a hallowed vessel it would have been rendered invalid by remaining therein overnight. Hezekiah<sup>1</sup> replied, Vessels of ministry do not in fact hallow their contents where there was no intention, but [the use of a hallowed vessel was here forbidden] as a preventive measure lest it be assumed that there was intention that the contents should be hallowed.<sup>2</sup>

R. Jannai citing R. Zera replied, You may even say that a fixed amount has been prescribed for the water [of libation]<sup>3</sup> and that vessels of ministry do not hallow their contents unless there was intention, [but the use of a hallowed vessel was nevertheless forbidden] as a preventive measure lest people will think that it was filled with the water for the purpose of using it for the washing of the hands and the feet [of the High Priest].<sup>4</sup>

IF IT WAS Poured AWAY OR UNCOVERED, etc. But why?<sup>5</sup> Could it not<sup>6</sup> be filtered through a strainer?<sup>7</sup> Must we then say<sup>8</sup> that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Nehemiah, for it has been taught, [Liquid that has passed through] a strainer is forbidden under the law of uncovering, and R. Nehemiah stated, When

does this apply? Only when the receptacle underneath<sup>9</sup> was uncovered, but when the receptacle underneath is covered, even although the upper one<sup>10</sup> was uncovered, the law of uncovering does not apply, since the venom of a serpent is like a fungus which floats on the surface and remains where it is?<sup>11</sup> —

You may even maintain that it agrees with R. Nehemiah, since it may be submitted that R. Nehemiah's ruling referred to secular use, but not to one divine,<sup>12</sup> for does not R. Nehemiah uphold [the lesson of the verse,] Present it<sup>13</sup> now to thy governor; will he be pleased with thee? Or will he accept thy person?<sup>14</sup>

## CHAPTER V

*MISHNAH.* THE FLUTE-PLAYING [TOOK PLACE] SOMETIMES [ON] FIVE DAYS AND SOMETIMES ON SIX. THIS REFERS TO THE FLUTE-PLAYING AT BETH HA-SHO'EBAH [THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING]<sup>15</sup> WHICH OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR ANY FESTIVAL DAY.<sup>16</sup>

(1) Granting that our Mishnah provides evidence that no specific quantity has been prescribed for the water of libation.

(2) And those observing that the water is used despite the fact that it was kept overnight might draw the wrong conclusion that hallowed objects of similar nature are equally unaffected by a stay overnight.

(3) Three logs, according to the Rabbis, and one log according to R. Judah.

(4) Such water must first be hallowed (cf. Ex. XXX, 19) and however large its quantity it might still be regarded as intended to be used for this purpose. If the water were allowed to be used on the next day, wrong conclusions (cf. p. 234 n. 6) might be drawn.

(5) Should uncovered water be invalid.

(6) Since the only reason why uncovered water is forbidden is lest a snake injected its venom into it.

(7) And thus eliminate the venom.

(8) Since the use of a filter is not allowed.

(9) The strainer, i.e., the one that receives the filtered water.

(10) Sc. the strainer.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

(11) In the strainer. B.K. 115b, cf. B.B. 97b.

(12) Lit., 'for the Most High'.

(13) I.e., the blind, the lame and the sick, mentioned by the prophet in the earlier part of the verse.

(14) Mal. I, 8; sc. would you offer to God what is rejected by man? As those objectionable offerings (cf. prev. n.) were condemned by the prophet as unsuitable, so is any objectionable thing (such as liquid that was exposed and possibly

contaminated by venom) to be condemned as unsuitable for any divine service.

(15) [בית השואבה]. The exact meaning of the term which also appears in the form שואבה (v. D.S. a.l.) is not clear. For a full discussion of the ceremony v. Feuchtwanger S., MGWJ. LIV-45]. For the details v. infra.

(16) Therefore when one of the Intermediate Days was a Sabbath it was performed on five days only.

## Sukkah 50b

**GEMARA.** It was stated, Rab Judah and R. Ina differ, one of them taught Sho'ebah<sup>1</sup> and the other taught Hashubah.<sup>2</sup> Mar Zutra observed, He who teaches, Sho'ebah is not in error, and he who teaches Hashubah is not in error. He who teaches Sho'ebah<sup>1</sup> is not in error, since it is written, And ye shall draw water in joy,<sup>3</sup> and he who teaches Hashubah is not in error, since R. Nahman stated, It is an important precept, dating from the very Creation.<sup>4</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, The flute-playing overrides the Sabbath; so R. Jose b. Judah; but the Sages ruled, It does not override even the Festival. R. Joseph explained, The disputes concerns only the song that accompanied the sacrifices,<sup>6</sup> since R. Jose is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music is the instrument, in consequence of which it is a Temple service which overrides the Sabbath, whereas the Rabbis are of the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music is the vocal singing, in consequence of which the [playing of the instruments] is not a Temple service and does not, therefore, override the Sabbath; but with regard to the singing at the Festival of Water-Drawing, all agree

that it is a mere expression of rejoicing and does not, therefore, override the Sabbath. Whence, said R. Joseph, do I derive that the dispute concerns only that?<sup>7</sup>

From what has been taught, If vessels of ministry were made of wood, Rabbi declares them invalid and R. Jose b. Judah holds them to be valid.<sup>8</sup> Now do they not differ on this principle, that he who declares them valid is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music is the instrument<sup>9</sup> and [its validity may, therefore,] be deduced from that of the reed-flute of Moses,<sup>10</sup> while he who holds them to be invalid is of the opinion that the essential feature of the Temple music is the vocal singing<sup>11</sup> and its validity, therefore, cannot be deduced from that of the reed-flute of Moses? —

No; both of them may agree that the essential feature of the [Temple] music is the instrument, but in this case they differ on the question whether we may deduce what it is possible [to manufacture from another material] from that which it is impossible [to manufacture from another material].<sup>12</sup> He who declares them valid is of the opinion that we do deduce that which it is possible [to manufacture from another material], from that which it is impossible [to manufacture from another material],<sup>13</sup> whereas he who holds them to be invalid is of the opinion that we do not deduce the possible from the impossible.<sup>14</sup> And if you wish you may say that all are in agreement that the essential feature of the [Temple] music is the vocal singing,<sup>15</sup> and that<sup>16</sup> we do not deduce the possible from the impossible,<sup>15</sup> but in this case they differ on the question whether, in making the deduction concerning the candlestick,<sup>17</sup> we apply the principle of 'the general and the particular' or the rule of 'extension and limitation'.<sup>18</sup>

Rabbi applies the principle of 'the general and the particular' while R. Jose b. Judah

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

applies the principle of ‘extension and limitation’.

Rabbi applies the principle of the ‘general and particular’ [thus:] And thou shalt make a candlestick<sup>19</sup> is a general statement, of pure gold<sup>19</sup> is a particular, of beaten work shall the candlestick be made<sup>19</sup> is again a general statement; [the instruction thus consists of] two general [statements] with a particular [statement between], in which case it includes only such things as are similar to the particular [statement],<sup>20</sup> so that as the particular is specified to be of metal, so must all [vessels] be of metal.

R. Jose b. Judah applies the principle of ‘extension and limitation’ [thus:] And thou shalt make a candlestick<sup>19</sup> is an extension, of pure gold<sup>19</sup> is a limitation, of beaten work shall the candlestick be made<sup>19</sup> is again an extension. The text thus gives two extensions with a limitation between in which case it includes everything [and excludes but one thing]. What does it include? All materials, and what does it exclude? [Only]<sup>21</sup> earthenware.

R. Papa stated,

- (1) ‘Water-drawing’.
- (2) ‘Important’. The phrase would thus mean ‘The Important Rejoicing of the Temple’. [This reading would support the variant Hashe’ubah השאובה (v. n. 1) with which it could easily be confused].
- (3) Isa. XII, 3.
- (4) When, as stated supra 49a, the Pits were created to receive the libations.
- (5) Between R. Jose and the Sages.
- (6) When the libation of wine was offered in connection with the continual morning and evening offerings (cf. ‘Ar. 10a).
- (7) Whether the vocal organs or the instruments are the essential features of the Temple music.
- (8) Sot. 14b.
- (9) And it may, therefore, be regarded as a Temple vessel.
- (10) Which was made of wood (cf. ‘Ar.10b). Tradition dated this reed-pipe from Moses. As that pipe was made of wood so may all musical instruments of the Temple be made of wood.

(11) So that the instrument cannot be regarded as one of the Temple vessels.

(12) It was impossible (as explained in ‘Ar. 10b) to make the best of pipes of anything but reeds. All other vessels, however, can be made from metal.

(13) Hence he allows all vessels to be made from wood as was the reed-pipe of Moses.

(14) Hence it is only the pipe, which (as stated supra) cannot be satisfactorily made of other materials, that may be made of wood, but not any other vessels which can well be made of metal.

(15) No deduction, therefore, may be made from Moses’ reed-pipe.

(16) Even if it were to be insisted that the essential feature of the music was the instrument.

(17) Of the sanctuary, which is regarded as the prototype of all the other vessels.

(18) Two methods of homiletics, the former employed by R. Ishmael, the latter by R. Akiba. Cf. Sanh., Sonc. ed., vol. I, p. 301, n. I.

(19) Ex. XXV, 31.

(20) Cf. P.B. p. 13.

(21) Since according to the principle of extension and limitation, only the most remote is excluded.

## Sukkah 51a

[This dispute<sup>1</sup> is] on the same principle as the one between the following Tannas concerning which we have learnt,<sup>2</sup> [The instrument players in the Temple] were the slaves of the priests; so R. Meir. R. Jose says, They were the families of Beth Ha-Pegarim, and Beth Zipporia who hailed from Emmaus<sup>3</sup> and were married into the priestly stock.<sup>4</sup> R. Hanina b. Antigonus says, They were Levites.<sup>5</sup> Now do they<sup>6</sup> not differ on the following principles: He who says that they were slaves is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music was the vocal singing,<sup>7</sup> while he who says that they were Levites holds the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music was the instrument?<sup>8</sup> —

But do you understand this? What then is the opinion upheld by R. Jose? If he is of the opinion that the essential feature of the [Temple] music was the singing, then even slaves [should be allowed to play the

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

instruments],<sup>9</sup> and if he is of the opinion that the essential feature was the instrument, should not then only Levites [be allowed to play] but not Israelites?<sup>10</sup> But the fact is that all agree that the essential feature of the [Temple] music was the vocal singing, but it is on this that they differ: One Master holds that the practice was as he stated<sup>11</sup> while the other Master holds that the practice was as he stated.<sup>11</sup> In what respect could this<sup>12</sup> matter? —

In respect of taking the fact that a man stood upon the platform<sup>13</sup> as proof of honorable descent<sup>14</sup> or [as proof that he is eligible for] tithes.<sup>15</sup> He who says that they were slaves is of the opinion that the fact that [one's ancestor] stood upon the platform is proof neither of honorable descent nor that [he is eligible for] tithes;<sup>16</sup> he who says that they were Israelites [of honorable family] is of the opinion that we accept the standing upon the platform as proof of honorable descent, but not [of eligibility for] tithes;<sup>17</sup> while he who says that they were Levites is of the opinion that the standing upon the platform is accepted as proof in regard to both honorable descent and [eligibility for] tithes.<sup>18</sup>

R. Jeremiah b. Abba, however, maintains<sup>19</sup> that the dispute<sup>20</sup> concerns only the music<sup>21</sup> at the Water-Drawing, since R. Jose b. Judah is of the opinion that even an added expression of Rejoicing<sup>22</sup> overrides the Sabbath, while the Rabbis are of the opinion that an added expression of Rejoicing does not override [either] the Sabbath [or the Festival], but as regards the music which accompanied the sacrifices, all agree that it is [an integral part of] the Service and overrides the Sabbath.

An objection was raised:<sup>23</sup> [It was taught,] The music which accompanied the Water-Drawing overrides the Sabbath. So R. Jose b. Judah. The Sages, however, rule that it does not override even the Festival. Is not

this a refutation of R. Joseph?<sup>24</sup> — It is indeed a refutation.

Can we also say that they<sup>25</sup> dispute only concerning the music which accompanied the Water-Drawing, but that with regard to the music that accompanied the sacrifices all<sup>26</sup> agree that it overrides the Sabbath, and this<sup>27</sup> would, therefore, constitute a double refutation of R. Joseph?<sup>28</sup> —

[No.] R. Joseph could answer you, They dispute concerning the music that accompanied the Water-Drawing and the same applies also to [that which accompanied] the sacrifices, and the reason that they expressed their different views with regard to the Water-Drawing was in order to acquaint you with the extent of the view of R. Jose b. Judah, viz., that even the music of the Water-Drawing overrides [the Sabbath].

Was it not, however, stated, THIS REFERS TO THE FLUTE-PLAYING AT THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING, WHICH OVERRIDES NEITHER THE SABBATH NOR ANY FESTIVAL DAY, [from which we can infer that] this [playing] does not override the Sabbath, but the playing which accompanied the sacrifices does override [the Sabbath]?<sup>29</sup> Now whose view is it? If you were to say that it is that of R. Jose b. Judah, did he not state that the playing which accompanies the Water-Drawing also overrides the Sabbath?<sup>30</sup> Consequently it must be, [must it not,] the view of the Rabbis, and thus<sup>31</sup> arises a double refutation of R. Joseph?<sup>32</sup> It is indeed a refutation.

What is the reason of him who stated that the essential feature of the [Temple] music was the instrument? —

Because it is written, And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt-offering upon the altar. And when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

also, and the trumpets together with the instruments of David, King of Israel.<sup>33</sup> What is the reason of him who stated that the essential feature of the Temple music was the vocal singing? —

Because it is written, It came even to pass, when the trumpeters and the singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard.<sup>34</sup> As to the other also,<sup>35</sup> is it not written, ‘and Hezekiah commanded, etc.’?<sup>36</sup> — It is this that was meant: The song of the Lord began’ vocally ‘together with the instruments of David, King of Israel’, which were but to sweeten the voice. And as to the other one too,<sup>37</sup> is it not written, ‘it came even to pass, when the trumpeters and singers were as one’?<sup>38</sup> — It is this that was meant: ‘The singers’ performed in the same manner as ‘the trumpeters’. Just as the trumpeters [performed] with instruments, so did the singers [perform] with instruments.

**MISHNAH.** HE<sup>39</sup> WHO HAS NOT SEEN THE REJOICING AT THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING HAS NEVER SEEN REJOICING IN HIS LIFE. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF TABERNACLES THEY<sup>40</sup> DESCENDED<sup>41</sup> TO THE COURT OF THE WOMEN<sup>42</sup> WHERE THEY HAD MADE A GREAT ENACTMENT.<sup>43</sup> THERE WERE THERE GOLDEN CANDLESTICKS WITH FOUR GOLDEN BOWLS ON THE TOP OF EACH OF THEM AND FOUR LADDERS<sup>44</sup> TO EACH, AND FOUR YOUTHS DRAWN FROM THE PRIESTLY STOCK IN WHOSE HANDS WERE HELD JARS OF OIL CONTAINING ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY LOG WHICH THEY Poured INTO THE BOWLS.<sup>45</sup> FROM THE WORN-OUT DRAWERS AND GIRDLES OF THE PRIESTS THEY MADE WICKS AND WITH THEM THEY KINDLED THE LAMPS; AND<sup>46</sup> THERE WAS NOT A COURTYARD IN JERUSALEM THAT WAS NOT ILLUMINED BY THE LIGHT OF THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING. MEN OF PIETY AND

## GOOD DEEDS<sup>47</sup> USED TO DANCE BEFORE THEM

- (1) Whether the vocal singing or the instrumental playing was the essential feature of the Temple service.
- (2) Cur. edd. in parenthesis ‘it was taught’.
- (3) Near Tiberias.
- (4) Because they were Israelites of pure and honorable descent (cf. Kid. IV, 5).
- (5) V. ‘Ar. 10a.
- (6) The three Tannas just mentioned.
- (7) As this was done by the Levites, slaves were allowed to play the instruments.
- (8) Hence only the Levites were allowed to play it.
- (9) Supra n. 5.
- (10) Why then does he allow Israelites.
- (11) Lit., ‘thus’.
- (12) The type of the instrument players.
- (13) Dukan, the platform upon which the Levites stood in the Temple during the singing of the Psalms (cf. ‘Ar. II, 6).
- (14) Lit., ‘whether we raise one from the Dukan to (an honorable) pedigree’. The Jews were proud of their lineage and investigated the descent of the women whom they wished to marry for four generations back. (V. Kid. IV, 4 and 5).
- (15) I.e., that he is a Levite.
- (16) Hence it is permitted even for slaves to take part.
- (17) Honorable Israelites only were, therefore, allowed to participate.
- (18) Levites only were, therefore, allowed to ascend the platform.
- (19) Contrary to the view of R. Joseph supra 50b.
- (20) Of R. Jose b. Judah and the Rabbis.
- (21) Sc. the instrument playing.
- (22) Even if it is not an integral part of the Service.
- (23) To R. Joseph's view.
- (24) Who stated that R. Jose agreed that the music at the Water-Drawing did not override the Sabbath.
- (25) R. Jose and the Sages.
- (26) Even the Sages.
- (27) Since he submitted that the Sages hold that this music does not override the Sabbath.
- (28) Both with regard to the Water-Drawing and the sacrifices. In the case of the former he maintained that R. Jose holds that it does not override the Sabbath, while here it is shown that according to R. Jose it does override it; while in the case of the latter he maintained that the Sages hold that it does not override the Sabbath, from here it might be inferred that according to their view it does.



# SUCCA – 29b-56b

- (29) Apparently we can.
- (30) While here it is stated that it does not override it.
- (31) Since the Rabbis here admit that the music at the sacrifice overrides the Sabbath while R. Joseph maintained that according to their view it does not override it.
- (32) V. p. 240, n. 11.
- (33) II Chron. XXIX, 27. Thus the other instruments no less than the trumpets sounded at the time of sacrifice, make 'the song of the Lord'; v. next note.
- (34) II Chron, V, 13, where no instrumental music is mentioned. 'The trumpeters' refers not to the players of the instruments that accompanied the singing, but to those who sounded the trumpets at the time of sacrifice. Hence it was 'the singers' alone who made here the music (V. Rashi).
- (35) Who holds that the vocal music was an essential feature of the Temple service.
- (36) Which proves that the instruments were an essential.
- (37) Who stated that the instruments were an essential feature.
- (38) Which, as shown supra, implies that the music was only vocal.
- (39) Separate edd. of the Mishnah read, 'They said: He who', etc.
- (40) The priests and Levites.
- (41) The fifteen steps (mentioned later in our Mishnah) that led from the Court of the Israelites.
- (42) Cf. Mid. II, 5.
- (43) The Gemara infra explains this.
- (44) To ascend to the top, since they were fifty cubits high (v. infra).
- (45) This is explained in the Gemara infra.
- (46) Owing to the considerable height of the lamps (cf. prev. n.) and the high altitude of the Temple mount on which the court was situated.
- (47) Or 'miracle workers', lit., 'men of work' (cf. Sot. IX, 15).

## Sukkah 51b

WITH LIGHTED TORCHES IN THEIR HANDS,<sup>1</sup> AND SING SONGS AND PRAISES. AND LEVITES WITHOUT NUMBER WITH HARPS, LYRES, CYMBALS AND TRUMPETS AND OTHER MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS WERE THERE UPON THE FIFTEEN STEPS LEADING DOWN FROM THE COURT OF THE ISRAELITES TO THE COURT OF THE WOMEN, CORRESPONDING TO THE FIFTEEN SONGS OF ASCENTS<sup>2</sup> IN THE PSALMS.<sup>3</sup> IT

WAS UPON THESE<sup>4</sup> THAT THE LEVITES STOOD<sup>5</sup> WITH THEIR INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC AND SANG THEIR SONGS.

TWO PRIESTS STOOD BY THE UPPER GATE WHICH LEADS DOWN FROM THE COURT OF THE ISRAELITES TO THE COURT OF THE WOMEN, WITH TWO TRUMPETS IN THEIR HANDS. WHEN THE COCK CROWED THEY SOUNDED A TEKI'AH [LONG DRAWN-OUT BLAST], A TERU'AH [TREMULOUS NOTE] AND AGAIN A TEKI'AH.<sup>6</sup> WHEN THEY REACHED THE TENTH STEP THEY SOUNDED A TEKI'AH, A TERU'AH AND AGAIN A TEKI'AH. WHEN THEY REACHED THE COURT<sup>7</sup> THEY SOUNDED A TEKI'AH, A TERU'AH AND AGAIN A TEKI'AH.<sup>8</sup> AND WHEN THEY REACHED THE GROUND<sup>9</sup> THEY SOUNDED A TEKI'AH, A TERU'AH, AND AGAIN A TEKI'AH.<sup>10</sup> THEY PROCEEDED, SOUNDING THEIR TRUMPETS, UNTIL THEY REACHED THE GATE WHICH LEADS OUT TO THE EAST.

WHEN THEY REACHED THE GATE WHICH LEADS OUT TO THE EAST, THEY TURNED THEIR FACES FROM EAST TO WEST<sup>11</sup> AND PROCLAIMED, OUR FATHERS<sup>12</sup> WHO WERE IN THIS PLACE [STOOD] WITH THEIR BACKS TOWARD THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD, AND THEIR FACES TOWARD THE EAST, AND THEY WORSHIPPED THE SUN TOWARD THE EAST,<sup>13</sup> BUT AS FOR US, OUR EYES ARE TURNED TO THE LORD'. R. JUDAH STATED, THEY USED TO REPEAT [THE LAST WORDS] AND SAY 'WE ARE THE LORD'S AND OUR EYES ARE TURNED TO THE LORD'.

*GEMARA.* Our Rabbis taught, He who has not witnessed the rejoicing at the place of the Water-Drawing has never seen rejoicing in his life. He who has not seen Jerusalem in her splendor, has never seen a desirable city in his life. He who has not seen the Temple in its full construction has never seen a glorious building in his life. Which Temple?<sup>14</sup> —

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

Abaye, or it might be said, R. Hisda, replied, The reference is to the building of Herod.<sup>15</sup> Of what did he build it? — Rabbah<sup>16</sup> replied, Of yellow and white marble. Some there are who say, With yellow, blue and white marble. The building rose in tiers<sup>17</sup> in order to provide a hold for the plaster. He<sup>18</sup> intended at first to overlay it with gold, but the Rabbis told him, Leave it alone for it is more beautiful as it is, since<sup>19</sup> it has the appearance of the waves of the sea.

It has been taught, R. Judah stated, He who has not seen the double colonnade<sup>20</sup> of Alexandria in Egypt<sup>21</sup> has never seen the glory of Israel. It was said that it was like a huge basilica, one colonnade within the other, and it sometimes held<sup>22</sup> twice the number of people that went forth from Egypt.<sup>23</sup> There were in it seventy-one cathedras of gold, corresponding to the seventy-one members of the Great Sanhedrin,<sup>24</sup> not one of them containing less than twenty-one<sup>25</sup> talents of gold, and a wooden platform in the middle upon which the attendant of the Synagogue stood with a scarf in his hand. When the time came to answer Amen,<sup>26</sup> he waved his scarf and all the congregation<sup>27</sup> duly responded. They moreover did not occupy their seats promiscuously, but goldsmiths sat separately, silversmiths separately, blacksmiths separately, metalworkers separately and weavers separately, so that when a poor man entered the place he recognized the members of his craft and on applying<sup>28</sup> to that quarter obtained a livelihood for himself and for the members of his family.<sup>29</sup> Abaye stated, Alexander of Macedon<sup>30</sup> slew them all. Why were they so punished? —

Because they transgressed this verse: Ye shall henceforth return no more<sup>31</sup> that way,<sup>32</sup> and they did return. When he<sup>33</sup> came and found them reading from The Book, 'The Lord will bring a nation against thee

from afar',<sup>34</sup> he remarked, 'I<sup>35</sup> should have brought my ships in a ten days' journey, but as a strong wind arose the ships arrived in five days'! He, therefore,<sup>36</sup> fell upon them and slew them.

**AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY, etc.** What was the **GREAT ENACTMENT?** — R. Eleazar replied, As that of which we have learnt. Originally [the walls of the Court of the Women] were smooth,<sup>37</sup> but [later the Court] was surrounded with a gallery, and it was enacted that the women should sit above and the men below.<sup>38</sup>

Our Rabbis have taught, Originally the women used to sit within [the Court of the Women] while the men were without, but as this caused levity, it was instituted that the women should sit without and the men within. As this, however, still led to levity, it was instituted that the women should sit above<sup>39</sup> and the men below. But how could they do so?<sup>40</sup> Is it not written, All this [do I give thee] in writing as the Lord hath made me wise by His hand upon me?<sup>41</sup> —

Rab answered, They found a Scriptural verse and expounded it:

- (1) Throwing them up and catching them again, and performing this feat with four or eight torches throwing up and catching one after the other (Rashi).
- (2) So with sep. edd. of the Mishnah. Cur. edd. omit 'SONGS OF' and insert 'ASCENTS' in parenthesis.
- (3) Ps. CXX-CXXXIV.
- (4) And not at the side of the altar where they performed at the time of the offering of the sacrifices.
- (5) At the festivities of the Water-Drawing.
- (6) This was a call to proceed to draw the water of libation from Siloam.
- (7) Sc. the floor of the Court of the Women.
- (8) The last sentence is deleted by Elijah Wilna.
- (9) Elijah Wilna adds, 'of the court'.
- (10) Cur. edd. enclose the last sentence in parenthesis.
- (11) Thus facing the Temple.
- (12) In the days of the first Temple.
- (13) Cf. Ezek. VIII, 16.

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

(14) Lit., 'what is it (to which the reference is made)'. There were the Temples of Solomon, Nehemiah and Herod.

(15) Herod rebuilt the Temple. For a full description cf. Josephus, Ant. XV, 11 v. also B.B. 4a.

(16) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'Raba'.

(17) Lit., 'he brought out an edge and brought in an edge'.

(18) Herod.

(19) On account of the variegated hues of the marble.

(20) \*\* i.e., the basilica-synagogue.

(21) From the foundation of the city by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C.E., the Jews formed an important section of the population with their own places of worship and other rights and privileges.

(22) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, '600,000 X 600,000'.

(23) I.e., 1,200,000.

(24) Bah read 'elders' for 'members of... Sanhedrin'.

(25) The reading 'twenty-one myriads' of cur. edd. is deleted by Elijah Wilna.

(26) When e.g., the Reader concluded a benediction.

(27) To whom owing to the huge size of the Synagogue, the reader's voice was inaudible.

(28) For employment.

(29) [Whether this is to be identified with the beautiful Synagogue mentioned by Philo is not certain. Krauss S., Synagogale Altertumer, p. 261ff argues that this basilica was no Synagogue but a trading mart where the Jews would also hold services.]

(30) Var. lec., Trajan (Elijah Wilna). [Trajan is the name given in J. Suk. V, I, and the reference is to the massacre of the Jews in Alexandria under Trajan in 116 recorded by Eusebius. V. Derenbourg, Essai, p. 410ff and Graetz, Geschichte

IV, p. 117ff.]

(31) Sc. to Egypt.

(32) Deut. XVII, 16.

(33) The tyrant.

(34) Ibid. XXVIII, 49.

(35) Lit., 'that man'.

(36) Finding in the Scriptural verse and in the kindness of the elements that his expedition was providential.

(37) [So Rashi on basis of reading חלקה; var. lec. חלוקה '(the floor spacing) was divided (into two sections)'. V. D.S.].

(38) Cf. Mid. II, 5.

(39) On the gallery.

(40) Alter the original structure of the Temple.

(41) I Chron. XXVIII, 19, referring to the construction of the First Temple.

## Sukkah 52a

And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart.<sup>1</sup> Is it not, they said, an a fortiori argument? If in the future<sup>2</sup> when they will be engaged in mourning and the Evil Inclination will have no power over them,<sup>3</sup> the Torah<sup>4</sup> nevertheless says, men separately and women separately, how much more so nows when they are engaged in rejoicing and the Evil Inclination has sway over them.<sup>6</sup> What is the cause of the mourning [mentioned in the last cited verse]?<sup>1</sup> —

R. Dosa and the Rabbis differ on the point. One explained, The cause is the slaying of Messiah the son of Joseph,<sup>7</sup> and the other explained, The cause is the slaying of the Evil Inclination. It is well according to him who explains that the cause is the slaying of Messiah the son of Joseph, since that well agrees with the Scriptural verse, And they shall look upon me because they have thrust him through, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son;<sup>8</sup> but according to him who explains the cause to be the slaying of the Evil Inclination, is this [it may be objected] an occasion for mourning? Is it not rather an occasion for rejoicing? Why then should they weep? —

[The explanation is] as R. Judah expounded: In the time to come<sup>9</sup> the Holy One, blessed be He, will bring the Evil Inclination and slay it in the presence of the righteous and the wicked. To the righteous it will have the appearance of a towering hill, and to the wicked it will have the appearance of a hair thread. Both the former and the latter will weep; the righteous will weep saying, 'How were we able to overcome such a towering hill!' The wicked also will weep saying, 'How is it that we were unable to conquer this hair thread!' And the Holy One, blessed be He,

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

will also marvel together with them, as it is said, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, If it be marvelous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in those days, it shall also be marvelous in My eyes.<sup>11</sup>

R. Assi stated, The Evil Inclination is at first like the thread of a spider, but ultimately<sup>12</sup> becomes like cart ropes, as it is said, Woe unto them that draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart-rope.<sup>13</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, The Holy One, blessed be He, will say to the Messiah, the son of David (May he reveal himself speedily in our days!), 'Ask of me anything, and I will give it to thee', as it is said, I will tell of the decree, etc. this day have I begotten thee, ask of me and I will give the nations for thy inheritance.<sup>14</sup> But when he will see that the Messiah the son of Joseph is slain, he will say to Him, 'Lord of the Universe, I ask of Thee only the gift of life'. 'As to life', He would answer him, 'Your father David has already prophesied this concerning you', as it is said, He asked life of thee, thou gavest it him, [even length of days for ever and ever].<sup>15</sup>

R. 'Awira or, as some say, R. Joshua b. Levi, made the following exposition: The Evil Inclination has seven names. The Holy One, blessed be He, called it Evil, as it is said, For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.<sup>16</sup> Moses called it the Uncircumcised, as it is said, Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart.<sup>17</sup> David called it Unclean, as it is said, Create me a clean heart, O Lord,<sup>18</sup> which implies that there is an unclean one. Solomon called it the Enemy, as it is said, If thine enemy<sup>19</sup> be hungry, give him bread<sup>20</sup> to eat and if he be thirsty give him water to drink.<sup>21</sup> For thou wilt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord will reward thee;<sup>22</sup> read not, 'will reward thee'<sup>23</sup> but 'will cause it to be at peace with thee.'<sup>24</sup> Isaiah called it the Stumbling-Block, as it is said, Cast ye up,

Cast ye up, clear the way, take up the stumbling-block out of the way of my people.<sup>25</sup> Ezekiel called it Stone, as it is said, And I will take away the heart of stone out of your flesh and I will give you a heart of flesh.<sup>26</sup> Joel called it the Hidden One, as it is said, But I will remove far off from you the hidden one.<sup>27</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: 'But I will remove far off from you the hidden one',<sup>27</sup> refers to the Evil Inclination which is constantly hidden in the heart of man; and will drive him into a land barren and desolate<sup>28</sup> means, to a place where there are no men for him to attack; with his face toward the eastern sea,<sup>28</sup> [implies] that he set his eyes against the First Temple<sup>29</sup> and destroyed it and slew the scholars who were therein; and his hinder part toward the western sea<sup>28</sup> [implies] that he set his eyes against the Second Temple and destroyed it and slew the scholars who were therein. That his foulness may come up and his ill-savor may come up<sup>28</sup> [means] that he leaves the other nations in peace and attacks only Israel.<sup>30</sup> Because he hath done great things.<sup>28</sup>

Abaye explained, Against scholars<sup>31</sup> more than against anyone;<sup>32</sup> as was the case when Abaye heard a certain man saying to a woman, 'Let us arise betimes and go on our way'. 'I will', said Abaye, 'follow them in order to keep them away from transgression' and he followed them for three parasangs across the meadows. When they parted company<sup>33</sup> he heard them say, 'Our company is pleasant, the way is long'.<sup>34</sup> 'If it were I',<sup>35</sup> said Abaye, 'I could not have restrained myself', and so went and leaned in deep anguish against a doorpost, when a certain old man<sup>36</sup> came up to him and taught him: The greater the man, the greater his Evil Inclination.

R. Isaac stated, The [Evil] Inclination of a man grows stronger within him from day to day, as it is said, Only

(1) Zech. XII, 12.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

- (2) The time alluded to in the text cited.
- (3) So that levity is least to be expected.
- (4) Sc. Scripture, in the statement ‘and their wives apart’.
- (5) At the festivities of the Water-Drawing.
- (6) And undue levity is most likely.
- (7) The precursor of the Messiah ben David, the herald of the true Messianic age.
- (8) Zech. XII, 10.
- (9) The Messianic age.
- (10) E.V., ‘Should it’.
- (11) Zech. VIII, 6.
- (12) If the man continues to yield to temptation.
- (13) Isa. V, 18.
- (14) Ps. II, 7 and 8.
- (15) Ps. XXI, 5.
- (16) Gen. VIII, 21.
- (17) Deut. X, 16; the heart is the supposed seat of the Evil Inclination.
- (18) Ps. LI, 12.
- (19) The Evil Inclination.
- (20) Sc. the study of the Torah.
- (21) Sc. the study of the Torah.
- (22) Prov. XXV, 21 and 22.
- (23) Yeshalem lak.
- (24) Yashlimenu lak.
- (25) Isa. LVII, 14.
- (26) Ezek XXXVI, 26.
- (27) Joel II, 20; E.V., ‘northern one’.
- (28) Ibid.
- (29) Synonymous with sea (cf. Rashi).
- (30) Lit., ‘the enemies of Israel’, a euphemism.
- (31) Who are ‘great’ men.
- (32) Does the Evil Inclination act.
- (33) Each one having had to go in a different direction.
- (34) Sc. much as they would have liked to go together they must part company since they had to go in different directions.
- (35) Lit., ‘he who hates me’, euphemism.
- (36) Tradition identifies the anonymous old man with the spirit of Elijah.

## Sukkah 52b

evil all the day.<sup>1</sup> R. Simeon b. Lakish stated, The Evil Inclination of a man grows in strength from day to day and seeks to kill him, as it is said, The wicked watcheth the righteous and seeketh to slay him;<sup>2</sup> and were it not that the Holy One, blessed be He, is his help, he would not be able to withstand it, as it is said, The Lord will not leave him in his hand, nor suffer him to be condemned when he is judged.<sup>3</sup>

The school of R. Ishmael taught, If this repulsive wretch<sup>4</sup> meets thee, drag him to the Beth HaMidrash.<sup>5</sup> If he is of stone, he will dissolve, if of iron he will shiver into fragments. ‘If he is of stone he will dissolve’, for it is written, Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters<sup>6</sup> and it is written, The waters wear the stones.<sup>7</sup> ‘If he is of iron, he will shiver into fragments’, for it is written, Is not my word like as fire? Saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?<sup>8</sup>

R. Samuel b. Nahmani citing R. Johanan stated, The Evil Inclination entices man in this world and testifies against him in the world to come, as it is said, He that delicately bringeth up his servant from a child shall have him become a man<sup>9</sup> at the last,<sup>10</sup> for according to the Atbah<sup>11</sup> of R. Hiyya a witness<sup>12</sup> is called<sup>13</sup> manon.<sup>14</sup>

R. Huna pointed out an incongruity: It is written, For the spirit of harlotry hath caused them to err,<sup>15</sup> but is it not also written, [For the spirit of harlotry] is within them?<sup>16</sup> First it only causes them to err, but ultimately it enters into them.

Raba observed, First he<sup>17</sup> is called a passer-by, then he is called a guest, and finally he is called a man,<sup>18</sup> for it is said, And there came a passer-by<sup>17</sup> to the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, to dress for the guest<sup>17</sup> and then it is written, but took the poor man's lamb and dressed it for the man<sup>17</sup> that was come to him.<sup>19</sup>

R. Johanan remarked, There is a small organ in man which satisfies him when in hunger and makes him hunger when satisfied,<sup>20</sup> as it is said, When they were starved<sup>21</sup> they became full, etc.<sup>22</sup>

R. Hana b. Abba stated: It was said at the schoolhouse, There are four things of which the Holy One, blessed be He, repents that He had created them, and they are the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

following: Exile, the Chaldeans, the Ishmaelites and Evil Inclination. ‘The Exile’, since it is written, Now, therefore, what do I here, saith the Lord, seeing that My people is taken away for naught, etc.;<sup>23</sup> ‘the Chaldeans’, since it is written, Behold the land of the Chaldeans — this is the people that was not;<sup>24</sup> ‘the Ishmaelites’, since it is written, The tents of the robbers<sup>25</sup> prosper, and they that provoke God are secure since God brought them with His hand;<sup>26</sup> ‘the Evil Inclination’, since it is written, [And I will gather her that is driven away] and her that I have afflicted.<sup>27</sup>

R. Johanan remarked, Were it not for [the declarations in] the following three Scriptural verses,<sup>28</sup> the feet of the enemies of Israel<sup>29</sup> would have sunk. One is the verse, And her that I have afflicted;<sup>30</sup> the other is the verse, Behold, as the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in My hand, O House of Israel;<sup>31</sup> and the third, And I will take away the heart of stone out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh.<sup>32</sup>

R. Papa observed, [This may be derived] from the following verse also, And I will put My spirit into you.<sup>33</sup> And the Lord showed me four craftsmen.<sup>34</sup> Who are these ‘four craftsmen’? —

R. Hana b. Bizna citing R. Simeon Hasida replied: The Messiah the son of David, the Messiah the son of Joseph, Elijah and the Righteous Priest.<sup>35</sup>

R. Shesheth objected,<sup>36</sup> If so, was it correct to write, These<sup>37</sup> are the horns which scattered Judah,<sup>38</sup> seeing that they came to turn [them] back?<sup>39</sup> — The other answered him, Go to the end of the verse: These then are come to frighten them, to cast down the horns of the nations, which lifted up their horns against the Land of Judah, to scatter it<sup>40</sup>, etc. Why, said R. Shesheth to him, should I argue with Hana in Aggada?<sup>41</sup> And this shall be peace: when the Assyrian shall come into our land, and when he shall tread

in our palaces, then shall we raise up against him seven shepherds and eight princes among men.<sup>42</sup> Who are the ‘seven shepherds’? — David in the middle, Adam, Seth and Methuselah<sup>43</sup> on his right, and Abraham, Jacob and Moses<sup>44</sup> on his left. And who are the ‘eight princes among men’? — Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Zedekiah, the Messiah, and Elijah.<sup>45</sup>

FOUR LADDERS, etc. A Tanna taught, the height of a candlestick was fifty cubits.

AND FOUR YOUTHS DRAWN FROM THE PRIESTLY STOCK IN WHOSE HANDS WERE HELD JARS OF OIL CONTAINING ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY LOG. It was asked: Were there one hundred and twenty log for<sup>46</sup> all of them or one hundred and twenty log for each? —

Come and hear: With jars of oil in their hands, each of thirty log making a total of one hundred and twenty log.

A Tanna taught, And they<sup>47</sup> were superior<sup>48</sup> to the son of Martha the daughter of Boethus.<sup>49</sup> It was said of the son of Martha the daughter of Boethus, that he<sup>50</sup> could take<sup>51</sup> two sides of a huge ox which cost one thousand Zuz and walk with them,<sup>52</sup> heel to toe,<sup>53</sup> but the Sages would not permit him to do so because In the multitude of the people is the King's glory.<sup>54</sup> In what respect, however, were they<sup>55</sup> superior? If you will say because of the weight do not those<sup>56</sup> weigh more?<sup>57</sup> — The fact is that in that case there was an ascent every four [cubits length of which rose only to a height of about one cubit]<sup>58</sup> so that it was far from being perpendicular, while here there were ladders which were almost perpendicular.<sup>59</sup>

AND THERE WAS NOT A COURTYARD IN JERUSALEM. A Tanna taught,

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (1) Gen. VI, 5; as the days go on the evil increases.
- (2) Ps. XXXVII, 32.
- (3) Ibid. 33.
- (4) The Evil Inclination.
- (5) The schoolhouse, i.e., overcome it by your application to study.
- (6) Isa. LV, 1; sc. the Torah.
- (7) Job XIV, 19.
- (8) Jer. XXIII, 29. [This can also be rendered: 'like the hammer which the (granite) rock (against which it is struck) breaketh; the Evil Inclination being compared to an iron hammer and the Beth HaMidrash to a granite rock, v. Tosaf.].
- (9) **מנין** E.V., 'master'.
- (10) Prov. XXIX, 21.
- (11) A form of arrangement of the letters of the alphabet in groups of two, each group corresponding to the numerical value of ten (e.g. **ט"ה, ה"ט**) or a hundred (e.g. **פ"ו, ו"פ**) while nun which in the tens has no corresponding letter is grouped with he which in the units has no corresponding letter.
- (12) **סהדה** sahadah.
- (13) Since the letters **מ** and **ו** correspond to **ס** and **ד** and each **נ** corresponds to a **ה**.
- (14) **מנין**  $מ = ס, נ = ה, ו = ד, ך = ה$ .
- (15) Hos. IV, 12; the cause of the error thus being external.
- (16) Ibid. V, 4; i.e., internal.
- (17) Sc. the Evil Inclination.
- (18) Sc. an inmate, an occupier of the house.
- (19) II Sam. XII, 4.
- (20) The more one yields to one's passions the more mastery they gain. Cf. 'the appetite comes with the eating'.
- (21) **Kemar'itham**, apparently compared with the rt. of **Ra'ab** ('to hunger') or **Ra'** ('bad', 'lean'). E.V. 'fed'.
- (22) Hos. XIII, 6.
- (23) Isa. LII, 5.
- (24) Ibid. XXIII, 13; i.e., it were better if they had never existed.
- (25) Identified with the Arabs (Ishmaelites) who dwell all their lives in tents.
- (26) Job XII,6 E.V., 'in whatsoever God bringeth into their hand'.
- (27) Mic. IV, 6; by creating the Evil Inclination.
- (28) Which imply that God is responsible for the sins of His people.
- (29) Euphemism for Israel.
- (30) Mic. IV, 6; by creating the Evil Inclination.
- (31) Jer. XVIII, 6.
- (32) Ezek. XXXVI, 26.
- (33) Ibid. 27.
- (34) Zech. II, 3.
- (35) Identified in Gen. R. XLIII with **Melchizedek**. [MS.M. reads: **Melchizedek**. He

- represented the best type of Monotheist of the non-Jewish race].
- (36) [Read with MS.M.: demurred, **מתקייף לה**].
- (37) Presumably 'the craftsmen'.
- (38) Zech. II, 4, Which shows that it refers to enemies of Israel.
- (39) MS.M.: to rehabilitate them.
- (40) Zech. *ibid.*, which shows that the 'horns' refer to the enemies of Israel and not to the craftsmen.
- (41) He admitted defeat at the hands of an expert in homiletics.
- (42) Mic. V, 4.
- (43) Non-Jews.
- (44) Jews.
- (45) The Yalkut and Ein Jacob have **Elijah** before **Messiah**. Cf. Mal. III, 23.
- (46) Cf. Bah.
- (47) The youths, who were able to carry the heavy weight of oil mentioned.
- (48) In strength.
- (49) **Boethus** was the High Priest whose daughter **Martha** married **Joshua b. Gamala**, the institutor of the school system in Palestine, and who with her wealth bribed **Agrippa II** to appoint him High Priest, c. 64. She was a widow when she married **Joshua** and the reference here may be to a son of her first marriage.
- (50) Who was a priest.
- (51) Up the ascent to the altar.
- (52) Despite their heavy weight.
- (53) I.e., in a stately and slow manner.
- (54) Prov. XIV, 28; one ox had to be carried by twenty-four priests (cf. Yoma 26b).
- (55) The youths, who were able to carry the heavy weight of oil mentioned.
- (56) The two sides of an ox.
- (57) Than thirty log.
- (58) The total length of the ascent being thirty-two cubits and the height of the altar only nine cubits.
- (59) Needing greater physical effort to ascend them even though the weight one carried was less.

## Sukkah 53a

A woman could<sup>1</sup> sift wheat by the illumination of the place of the Water-Drawing.

**MEN OF PIETY AND GOOD DEEDS**, etc. Our Rabbis have taught, Some of them, used to say,<sup>2</sup> 'Happy our youth that has not disgraced our old age'. These were the men of piety and good deeds. Others used to say, 'Happy our old age which has atoned for

## SUCCAH – 29b-56b

our youth'. These were the penitents. The former and the latter, however, said, 'Happy he who hath not sinned, but let him who hath sinned return and He will pardon him.'<sup>3</sup>

It was taught, Of Hillel the Elder, It was said that when he used to rejoice at the Rejoicing at the place of the Water-Drawing, he used to recite thus, 'If I am here, everyone is here; but if I am not here, who is here?'<sup>4</sup> He also used to recite thus, 'To the place that I love, there My feet lead me: if thou wilt come into My House, I will come into thy house; if thou wilt not come to My House, I will not come to thy house, as it is laid, In every place where I cause My name to be mentioned, I will come unto thee and bless thee'.<sup>5</sup> He<sup>6</sup> moreover once saw a skull floating upon the face of the water. 'Because', he said to it, 'thou didst drown others, they have drowned thee, and they that drowned thee shall be drowned too'.<sup>7</sup> R. Johanan stated, A man's feet are responsible for him; they lead him to the place where he is wanted.<sup>8</sup>

There were once two Cushites<sup>9</sup> who attended on Solomon, and these were Elihoreph and Ahyah, the sons of Shisha, scribes,<sup>10</sup> of Solomon. One day Solomon observed that the Angel of Death was sad. 'Why', he said to him, 'art thou sad?' — 'Because', he answered him, 'they<sup>11</sup> have demanded from me the two Cushites who sit here'.<sup>12</sup> [Solomon thereupon] gave them in charge of the spirits<sup>13</sup> and sent them to the district of Luz.<sup>14</sup> When, however, they reached the district of Luz<sup>15</sup> they died. On the following day he observed that the Angel of Death was in cheerful spirits. 'Why', he said to him, 'art thou cheerful?' — 'To the place', the other replied, 'where they expected them from me, thither didst thou send them!'<sup>16</sup> Solomon thereupon uttered the saying, 'A man's feet are responsible for him; they lead him to the place where he is wanted'.

It was taught: They said of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel that when he rejoiced at the Rejoicing at the place of the Water-Drawing, he used to take eight lighted torches [and throw them in the air] and catch one and throw one and they did not touch one another;<sup>17</sup> and when he prostrated himself, he used to dig his two thumbs in the ground, bend down,<sup>18</sup> kiss the ground, and draw himself up again,<sup>18</sup> a feat which no other man could do, and this is what is meant by Kidah.<sup>19</sup>

Levi showed in the presence of Rabbi what Kidah is and as a result, became lame.<sup>20</sup> But was this the cause of his [lameness]? Did not R. Eleazar in fact state, One should never cast reproach against Providence, for a great man cast reproach against Providence and was as a result rendered lame, and he was<sup>21</sup> Levi?<sup>22</sup> Both the former and the latter were the cause [of his lameness].<sup>23</sup>

Levi<sup>24</sup> used to juggle in the presence of Rabbi<sup>25</sup> with eight knives, Samuel before King Shapur<sup>26</sup> with eight glasses of wine,<sup>27</sup> and Abaye before Rabbah<sup>28</sup> with eight eggs or, as some say, with four eggs. It was taught: R. Joshua b. Hanania stated, When we used to rejoice at the place of the Water-Drawing, our eyes saw no sleep. How was this? The first hour [was occupied with] the daily morning sacrifice; from there [we proceeded] to prayers; from there [we proceeded] to the additional sacrifice, then the prayers to the additional sacrifice, then to the House of Study, then the eating and drinking, then the afternoon prayer, then the daily evening sacrifice, and after that the Rejoicing at the place of the Water-Drawing [all night]. But it cannot be so!<sup>29</sup> For did not R. Johanan rule, He who says, 'I take an oath not to sleep for three days' is to be flogged<sup>30</sup> and he may sleep forthwith?<sup>31</sup> — The fact is that what was meant was this: 'We did not enjoy a proper sleep', because they dozed on one another's shoulder.



# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

**FIFTEEN STEPS.** R. Hisda said to a certain Rabbi who was arranging his Aggadas before him,<sup>32</sup> ‘Have you heard in correspondence to what David composed his fifteen Songs of Ascent?’<sup>33</sup> — ‘Thus’, the other replied, ‘said R. Johanan: When David dug the Pits<sup>34</sup> the Deep rose up and threatened to submerge the world, and David thereupon uttered the fifteen Songs of Ascent and caused its waves to subside’. But if so, [asked R. Hisda,] ought it not to be Songs of Descent, instead of Ascent? — ‘Since you have reminded me’, the other replied ‘[I may say that] it was stated thus: When David dug the Pits, the Deep arose and threatened to submerge the world. "Is there anyone", David enquired, "who knows whether it is permitted to inscribe the [Ineffable] Name

- (1) Cf. Tosaf. a.l.
- (2) In the course of their praises.
- (3) Tosef. Sukkah IV, 2.
- (4) Ibid. IV, 3; ‘I’ referring to God (Rashi) or Israel (T.J. cf. Tosaf. a.l.).
- (5) Ex. XX, 21; all the personal pronouns in the passage referring to the divine presence.
- (6) Hillel.
- (7) Cf. Aboth II, 6; an expression of the idea of Divine Retribution.
- (8) By Death.
- (9) ‘Ethiopians’ or (with Rashi) ‘handsome men’, as the Rabbis render the noun in Num. XII, 1.
- (10) I Kings IV, 3.
- (11) In heaven.
- (12) Sc. death has been decreed against them.
- (13) Over whom Solomon had dominion (cf. Meg. 11b, on I Chron. XXIX, 23).
- (14) To save them from death. V. Gen. XXVIII, 19 and Judg. I, 23. Owing probably to the identification of this word with the one meaning ‘the indestructible bone of the vertebra’ (Lev. R., XVIII) tradition says that the Angel of Death had no power in Luz (v. Sot. 46b).
- (15) And were still at the gate.
- (16) It was decreed that they should die at the gate of Luz.
- (17) A form of juggling.
- (18) While still leaning on them.
- (19) A form of prostration mentioned in Scripture, translated ‘bowed their heads’ (Ex.

IV, 31). The feat consisted in the leverage of the body without bending or using the hands.

- (20) The tremendous strain dislocated his thigh.
- (21) Lit., ‘and who was he?’
- (22) V. Ta’an. 25a.
- (23) His reproach of God was the Divine cause, and his attempt to perform Kidah the occasion. Cf. ‘the ox dropped whets the knife’ (Shab. 32a).
- (24) On the occasion of the Rejoicing at the Water-Drawing.
- (25) R. Judah I, the Patriarch, who was always in a melancholy mood, sorrowing for Israel’s suffering and persecution, and whom his disciples were anxious to cheer.
- (26) Shapur I, King of Persia, with whom Samuel was on such terms of friendship that the latter was sometimes called King Shapur, cf. B.B. 115a (Sonc. ed., p. 475. n. 8).
- (27) Without spilling any of their contents.
- (28) Cur. edd. in parenthesis ‘Raba’.
- (29) That they had no sleep during all the days devoted to the rejoicings of the Water-Drawing.
- (30) For taking a false oath, since it is impossible to go three days without sleep.
- (31) Shebu. 25a.
- (32) [MS.M.: before R. Johanan].
- (33) Pss. CXX-CXXXIV.
- (34) R. Johanan disagrees with the previous view that the Pits were a natural formation dating from the Creation.

## Sukkah 53b

upon a shard, and cast it into the Deep that its waves should subside?" There was none who answered a word. Said David, "Whoever knows the answer and does not speak, may he be suffocated". Whereupon Ahitophel<sup>1</sup> adduced an a fortiori argument to himself: "If, for the purpose of establishing harmony between man and wife, the Torah said, Let My name that was written in sanctity<sup>2</sup> be blotted out by the water,<sup>3</sup> how much more so may it be done in order to establish peace in the world!" He, therefore, said to him, "It is permitted!" [David] thereupon inscribed the [Ineffable] Name upon a shard, cast it into the Deep and it subsided sixteen thousand cubits. When he saw that it had subsided to such a great extent, he said, "The nearer it is to the earth, the better the earth can be kept watered" and he uttered the fifteen Songs of Ascent and the Deep re-

## SUCAH – 29b-56b

ascended fifteen thousand cubits and remained one thousand cubits [below the surface]'. Ulla remarked, Deduce therefrom that the thickness of the earth's surface is one thousand cubits.<sup>4</sup> But do we not see that one has but to dig a little for the waters to emerge? — R. Mesharsheya answered, That is due to the high level<sup>6</sup> [of the source] of the Euphrates.<sup>7</sup>

**TWO PRIESTS STOOD BY THE UPPER GATE WHICH LEADS DOWN, etc.** R. Jeremiah asked, [What is meant by] 'THE TENTH STEP'? Does it mean that they descended five [of the fifteen] and stood upon the remaining ten, or rather that they descended ten and stood upon the five? — It cannot be decided.<sup>8</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, Since it is said, And their faces toward the east,<sup>9</sup> is it not obvious that their backs were toward the Temple of the Lord?<sup>9</sup> What then is the import of the statement, 'their backs were toward the Temple of the Lord'? It teaches that they uncovered themselves and committed there a nuisance.

**WE ARE THE LORD'S AND OUR EYES ARE TURNED TO THE LORD, etc.** But can it be so? Did not R. Zera in fact rule, He who repeats Shema', Shema'<sup>10</sup> is as though he said Modim, Modim [and he is silenced]?<sup>11</sup> — The fact is that it was this that they used to say, "They worshipped the sun toward the east" but as for us we give thanks unto the Lord, and to the Lord do our eyes hope'.<sup>12</sup>

**MISHNAH.** THEY NEVER SOUNDED LESS THAN TWENTY-ONE BLASTS IN THE TEMPLE,<sup>13</sup> AND NEVER MORE THAN FORTY-EIGHT. EVERY DAY THEY BLEW TWENTY-ONE BLASTS<sup>14</sup> IN THE TEMPLE, THREE AT THE OPENING OF THE GATES,<sup>15</sup> NINE AT THE DAILY MORNING SACRIFICE,<sup>16</sup> AND NINE AT THE DAILY EVENING SACRIFICE. AT THE ADDITIONAL SACRIFICES<sup>17</sup> THEY

SOUNDED AN ADDITIONAL NINE; AND ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH THEY ADDED SIX, THREE AS A SIGN TO THE PEOPLE TO CEASE FROM WORK AND THREE TO MARK A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE HOLY AND THE PROFANE.<sup>18</sup> ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH IN THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF THE [SUKKOTH] FESTIVAL, THERE WERE [THEREFORE] FORTY-EIGHT BLASTS, [VIZ.,] THREE AT THE OPENING OF THE GATES,<sup>15</sup> THREE AT THE UPPER GATE,<sup>19</sup> THREE AT THE LOWER GATE,<sup>20</sup> THREE AT THE WATER-DRAWING, THREE AT THE ALTAR,<sup>21</sup> NINE AT THE DAILY MORNING SACRIFICE, NINE AT THE DAILY EVENING SACRIFICE, NINE AT THE ADDITIONAL SACRIFICES, THREE AS A SIGN TO THE PEOPLE TO CEASE FROM WORK, AND THREE TO MARK A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE HOLY AND THE PROFANE.<sup>18</sup>

**GEMARA.** Our Mishnah does not agree with R. Judah, for it has been taught: R. Judah ruled, The minimum number of blasts is seven, and the maximum sixteen.<sup>22</sup> What is the basic principle of their dispute? — R. Judah is of the opinion that Teki'ah, Teru'ah and Teki'ah<sup>23</sup> are counted as one, and the Rabbis<sup>24</sup> are of the opinion that the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah are separate and distinct notes. What is the reason of R. Judah? —

Scripture says, And ye shall sound a Teki'ah Teru'ah,<sup>25</sup> which clearly proves that the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah are regarded as one.<sup>26</sup> And the Rabbis?<sup>27</sup> — That verse is required to teach that the Teru'ah must be preceded and followed by a sustained blast.<sup>28</sup> What then is the reason of the Rabbis? — Because it is written, And when the congregation is to be gathered together, ye shall sound a Teki'ah, but not a Teru'ah.<sup>29</sup> Now if you could imagine that the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah form one note, would the Divine Law say, 'Perform one half of the commandment, but not the other

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

half'?<sup>30</sup> And R. Judah?<sup>31</sup> — That sounding was a mere signal.<sup>32</sup> And the Rabbis? —

It was indeed a signal, but the Divine Law<sup>33</sup> made it into a commandment. Whose view is followed in that which R. Kahana stated, There must be no interval whatever between the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah?<sup>34</sup> — In agreement with whose view [you ask]? In agreement with that of R. Judah.<sup>35</sup> But<sup>36</sup> is not this obvious? —

- (1) The teacher of David. Cf. Aboth VI, 3 (the Baraitha of R. Meir).
- (2) On a scroll. V. Num. V, 23.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) Below which are 'the depths beneath'.
- (5) The water near the surface.
- (6) Lit., 'ladder'.
- (7) The Euphrates was reputed to have the highest source of all (Babylonian) rivers, v. Bek. 55a and Obermeyer, p. 56.
- (8) Teku, v. Glos.
- (9) Ezek. VIII, 16. V. our Mishnah.
- (10) In order to avoid any suggestion of Dualism, it was rigidly forbidden to the Reader to repeat the word Shema' (Deut. VI, 4), or the word Modim ('we give thanks') in the 'Amidah. (Ber. 33b).
- (11) Here also he appears to repeat the word God twice.
- (12) [Since each mention of the name of the Lord has reference to a different context, the suggestion of dualism does not arise].
- (13) On any day.
- (14) I.e., seven quavering sounds (Teru'ahs) each of which was preceded and followed by a sustained one (Teki'ah).
- (15) Of the Temple court.
- (16) When its libations were offered the Levites sang, and the blasts were blown at three intervals in the songs. At each interval there was one quavering blast preceded and followed by a sustained blast (cf. Tamid VII, 3).
- (17) On New Moons, Sabbaths and Festivals.
- (18) The Holy Sabbath and the profane weekdays.
- (19) The Nikanor Gate; v. Mishnah supra 51b.
- (20) That led out to the East.
- (21) When they set the willow-branches at the side of the altar, v. supra 45a.
- (22) Tosef. Sukkah IV, 10. In Zuckermann's edition, the reading is thirteen instead of sixteen.
- (23) The Teki'ah is a long drawn out sound and the Teru'ah a tremulous, quavering note.
- (24) In our Mishnah.

(25) Num. X, 5; E.V., 'And when ye blow an alarm'.

(26) So Rasha. Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'And it is written, an alarm they shall blow. How is this possible? By regarding the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah as one'.

(27) How, in view of this text can they maintain that the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah are regarded as separate blasts?

(28) Since in this verse Teki'ah precedes Teru'ah, and in another it follows it (cf. R. H. 34a). Cur. edd. in parenthesis insert, 'And whence does R. Judah deduce the necessity of a sustained blast preceding and following the Teru'ah? — He deduces it from the expression, a second time' (Num. X, 6).

(29) Num. X, 7; E.V., 'Ye shall blow, but ye shall not sound the alarm'.

(30) Hence their opinion that the Teki'ah and the Teru'ah are independent blasts.

(31) How, in view of this argument, does he justify his statement?

(32) For the camp. As it had no religious significance its incompleteness did not matter.

(33) By commanding its use.

(34) 'Ar. 10a.

(35) Who regards the three notes as one.

(36) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'if R. Judah'.

## Sukkah 54a

[No.] As it might have been said that it is also in agreement with the view of the Rabbis, and that its purpose<sup>1</sup> was to exclude the view of R. Johanan who laid down that if a man heard the nine Teki'ahs<sup>2</sup> in nine hours<sup>3</sup> during the day he has still fulfilled his obligation, therefore he informed us [that it agrees only with the view of R. Judah]. Might it not be suggested that it is indeed so?<sup>4</sup> — If it were so,<sup>5</sup> what could be meant by 'no interval whatever'?

ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH IN THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL, etc. But [the sounding of the trumpet] on the tenth step<sup>6</sup> he does not mention. In agreement with whose view then is our Mishnah? — It is in agreement with that of R. Eliezer b. Jacob, for it has been taught: Three blasts on the tenth step. R. Eliezer b. Jacob ruled, Three at the altar. He<sup>7</sup> who ruled three on the tenth step omits the three at the altar; and he<sup>8</sup> who

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

ruled three at the altar omits the three upon the tenth step. What is the reason of R. Eliezer b. Jacob? — Since one sounded the trumpet for the opening of the gates, why should one sound it on the tenth step? Is it not a gate!<sup>9</sup> It is, therefore, preferable that the trumpet should be sounded at the altar.

The Rabbis, however, are of the opinion that since one sounds the trumpet for the Water-Drawing,<sup>10</sup> why should one sound it at the altar?<sup>11</sup> It is, therefore, preferable to sound it upon the tenth step.<sup>12</sup>

When R. Aha b. Hanina came from the South, he brought a Baraitha with him [which read:] And the sons of Aaron the priests shall blow with trumpets.<sup>13</sup> Surely there was no need to state explicitly ‘shall blow’, since it is already written, Ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt-offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings.<sup>14</sup> Why then was it stated, ‘shall blow’? [To teach you that] the sounding of the trumpets is throughout in accordance with the number of the additional offerings.<sup>15</sup> He<sup>16</sup> taught this [Baraitha] and he also explained it to mean that the trumpet is to be sounded<sup>17</sup> for every single additional offering.<sup>18</sup>

We have learnt, ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH IN THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL THERE WERE [THEREFORE] FORTY-EIGHT BLASTS. Now if it were so,<sup>19</sup> why was it not stated<sup>20</sup> that on the Sabbath of the Festival<sup>21</sup> it was possible to have fifty-one blasts?<sup>22</sup> —

R. Zera answered, Because the trumpet was not sounded at the opening of the gates on the Sabbath.<sup>23</sup> Who is this, Raba exclaimed, who is not concerned about the flour [he grinds out]?<sup>24</sup> [The answer is untenable], firstly, because we have learnt EVERY DAY<sup>25</sup> and, secondly, even if there were<sup>26</sup> the same number,<sup>27</sup> it should still have been

stated that ‘on the Sabbath of the Festival they blew forty-eight blasts’ since from this statement one could make two deductions, that of R. Eliezer b. Jacob<sup>28</sup> and that of R. Aha b. Hanina.<sup>29</sup> The fact, however, is, Raba explained, [that the reason<sup>30</sup> is] because the trumpet was not sounded for the Water-Drawing on the Sabbath,<sup>31</sup> so that<sup>32</sup> the number was diminished much.<sup>33</sup> But<sup>34</sup> why was not the New Year that fell on a Sabbath mentioned<sup>35</sup> seeing that on it there are three additional sacrifices: The additional offering of the New Year, the additional offering of the New Moon, and the additional offering of the Sabbath?<sup>36</sup> —

It was necessary to teach the instance of the eve of the Sabbath in the Intermediate Days of the Festival in order to inform us that the law is in agreement with R. Eliezer b. Jacob.<sup>37</sup> Was it then asked why the one was not mentioned instead of the other? [The question in fact is] why is not the one mentioned as well as the other?<sup>38</sup> — [The Tanna of our Mishnah] might have mentioned some and omitted others. But what else did he omit to justify this omission also?<sup>39</sup> — He omitted the instance of the eve of Passover.<sup>40</sup>

- (1) In stating that there must be ‘no interval’.
- (2) Of the New Year (v. R.H. 34b).
- (3) I.e., at long intervals.
- (4) That R. Kahana's statement agrees also with the view of the Rabbis and excludes only that of R. Johanan.
- (5) That in agreement with the Rabbis, short intervals are permitted.
- (6) Of the Temple court; v. Mishnah supra 51b.
- (7) Sc. the Rabbis.
- (8) R. Eliezer.
- (9) Of course it is.
- (10) The rejoicing at which is the real cause of all the extra soundings of the trumpet on the Festival (Rashi).
- (11) I.e., where the sounding might appear to be due to the willow-branch ceremony.
- (12) Which makes it more evident that it is specially sounded on account of the Water-Drawing, as no other rite is connected with the tenth step.
- (13) Num. X, 8.
- (14) Num. X, 10.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (15) This is explained presently.
- (16) R. Aha b. Hanina.
- (17) The prescribed number of blasts.
- (18) If the day is, for instance, both a Sabbath and a Festival, the prescribed number of nine blasts must be sounded for each of the two additional offerings.
- (19) As R. Aha b. Hanina interpreted.
- (20) In giving the maximum number possible.
- (21) Since there are two additional sacrifices, that of Sabbath and that of the Festival.
- (22) Three more than on the Sabbath eve (according to R. Judah) on account of the second additional offering, after deducting the special six sounded on Sabbath eve.
- (23) So that there were three less than on the Sabbath eve.
- (24) A criticism of R. Zera: 'He does not care what answer he gives'.
- (25) Including the Sabbath day. If on the Sabbath no blasts were sounded at the opening of the gates the number on that day would have been less than the number so given in our Mishnah.
- (26) On the Sabbath and on the Sabbath eve.
- (27) Forty-eight.
- (28) That the blowing of the trumpets was upon the altar and not on the tenth step, as our Mishnah goes on to explain.
- (29) That the trumpet was sounded for every additional offering.
- (30) Why the Sabbath was not mentioned.
- (31) Since the water was drawn on the Sabbath eve (v. supra 48b).
- (32) On the Sabbath.
- (33) Those of the upper gates and the lower gates and the altar, besides those that served as a sign to cease work and to mark the distinction between the holy and the profane.
- (34) According to R. Aha who maintains that each additional offering was accompanied by additional blasts.
- (35) Among the maxima in our Mishnah.
- (36) Making a total of forty-eight: The twenty-one daily blasts and the twenty-seven for the three additional sacrifices.
- (37) As stated supra, that no blasts were sounded on the tenth step.
- (38) Lit., 'let him teach this and let him teach that'.
- (39) The answer that he mentioned some and omitted others is valid only if it can be shown that other instances beside the one under discussion have also been omitted.
- (40) The sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb was performed by three groups of the people, each one reading the Hallel three times and sounding three blasts on the trumpet each time, making a total of twenty-seven blasts (cf. Pes, 64a). which

added to the twenty-one blasts sounded daily, amounts to forty-eight.

## Sukkah 54b

If [the omission is to be justified] on account of the omission of the eve of the Passover, [the latter, it may be pointed out], is no omission, for this statement<sup>1</sup> is made according to<sup>2</sup> R. Judah who stated, Never in the life of the third group did they reach the verse, I love the Lord, for he heareth my voice,<sup>3</sup> since the people composing the group were few in number.<sup>4</sup> But<sup>5</sup> did you not say that the earlier part of our Mishnah is not in agreement with R. Judah?<sup>6</sup> —

Is it not possible that our Tanna agrees with R. Judah on one point<sup>7</sup> though he disagrees with him on another point?<sup>8</sup> What else then was omitted that we might say that this also was similarly omitted? — The other omission was the eve of the Passover which fell on the eve of a Sabbath, when six blasts are to be subtracted<sup>9</sup> and six<sup>10</sup> are to be added.

**AND NEVER MORE THAN FORTY-EIGHT. No?** But is there not the eve of the Passover which falls on the Sabbath, on which, if the statement is in agreement with R. Judah, there were fifty-one blasts, and if it is in agreement with the Rabbis<sup>11</sup> there were fifty-seven?<sup>12</sup> — [Our Mishnah] mentioned only those which recur annually, but does not mention the case of the eve of the Passover which falls on the Sabbath, since it does not occur every year. Does then the eve of the Sabbath in the Intermediate Days of a Festival occur every year? May it sometimes not happen at all, this being the case<sup>13</sup> when, for instance, the first day of the Festival coincides with the eve of the Sabbath?<sup>14</sup> —

No, when the first day of the Festival would coincide with the eve of the Sabbath, the Festival is postponed.<sup>15</sup> What is the reason?<sup>16</sup> — Because if the first day of the Festival were to fall on the eve of the

# SUCAH – 29b-56b

Sabbath, when would the Day of Atonement [of that year] be? On the [previous] Sunday.<sup>17</sup> Therefore it is postponed.<sup>18</sup> But do we postpone it? Have we not in fact learnt, The fats [of offerings performed on] the Sabbath<sup>19</sup> may be offered on the Day of Atonement;<sup>20</sup> and R. Zera furthermore stated, When I was<sup>21</sup> in the school of Rab in Babylon<sup>22</sup> I used to say that that which has been taught, 'If the Day of Atonement fell on the eve of the Sabbath, they did not sound the trumpet,<sup>23</sup> and if it fell at the conclusion of the Sabbath<sup>24</sup> they did not recite the Habdalah'<sup>25</sup> is agreed to by all,<sup>26</sup> but when I came up to Palestine<sup>27</sup> I found R. Judah the son of R. Simeon b. Pazzi that he sat at his studies and taught that it was in agreement with R. Akiba only?<sup>28</sup> —

This is no difficulty since the one statement<sup>29</sup> is according to the Rabbis<sup>30</sup> and the other<sup>31</sup> according to 'the Others',<sup>32</sup> for it has been taught, 'Others' say, There cannot be more than four weekdays' difference between the Pentecost of one year and the next, and between one New Year and the next,<sup>33</sup> and if the year was prolonged,<sup>34</sup> there would be five days.<sup>35</sup>

An objection was raised:<sup>36</sup> If New Moon fell on the Sabbath, the Psalm of the New Moon<sup>37</sup> supersedes the Psalm of the Sabbath.<sup>38</sup> Now if the law were [as R. Aha stated], why<sup>39</sup> should not one say both that of the New Moon and that of the Sabbath?<sup>40</sup> —

R. Safra replied: What is meant by 'supersedes'? That it<sup>41</sup> supersedes it<sup>42</sup> in the sense of taking precedence over it. But why? [Does not then] that which is constant take precedence over that which is not constant?<sup>43</sup> —

R. Johanan answered, [The New Moon Psalm was given precedence] in order that people should know that the New Moon has been fixed<sup>44</sup> at its proper time.<sup>45</sup> Do we then

use this<sup>46</sup> as a distinguishing sign? Do we not in fact use another distinguishing sign, as we have learnt:<sup>47</sup> 'The fats<sup>48</sup> of the Daily Morning offering were placed on the lower half of the Ascent [of the altar] on its east side,<sup>49</sup> while those of the additional offerings were placed on the lower half of the Ascent on its west side;<sup>50</sup> while those of the New Moon were placed beneath the rim of the altar below,'<sup>51</sup>

(1) The maximum of forty-eight blasts on the eve of the Passover.

(2) Lit., 'this according to whom'.

(3) Ps. CXVI,1; sc. they did not complete the Hallel even once. The number of blasts in their case was, therefore, no more than three.

(4) Pes. 64a; most of the people having joined the first, or the second group. Only in the case of these two groups, the offering of whose sacrifices took longer than the singing of the Hallel, owing to their large number, it was necessary to read it a second and a third time.

(5) For the reading cf. Rashal. Cur. edd., 'surely we have established'.

(6) Who, contrary to our Mishnah, enumerates a minimum of seven and a maximum of sixteen (v. supra 53b). Now is it likely that the latter clause will be in agreement with his view while the earlier one is not?

(7) As regards the Passover eve.

(8) The number of blasts. As this is, of course, possible the instance of the eve of the Passover could not obviously have been cited and, consequently, could not be regarded as an omission.

(9) From the blasts for the third group, in agreement with R. Judah's statement.

(10) Of the blast common to every Sabbath eve, the three for ceasing work and the three that served as a mark of distinction between the holy and the profane.

(11) Who, contrary to R. Judah's statement, maintain that the Hallel was recited three times by the last group also.

(12) Six more, three for each repetition of the Hallel.

(13) Lit., 'and how is this to be imagined?'

(14) The Water-Drawing does not override the first day of the Festival if it is a Sabbath, and the following Sabbath is already the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly on which the Water-Drawing ceremonial no longer took place.

(15) By one day. The previous month of Ellul is made to have thirty days instead of twenty-nine, so that the Friday which would have been the

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

fourteenth of Tishri is the thirteenth of the month.

(16) For the postponement of the first day of the Festival, and consequently, the first of Tishri by one day.

(17) Since the first day of the Festival is on the fifteenth of Tishri and the Day of Atonement is on the tenth of that month.

(18) The Day of Atonement was not allowed to fall on a Sunday on account of the difficulties involved. (V. R.H. 20a).

(19) Sc. the daily evening sacrifice.

(20) Which immediately follows it. (Shab. XV, 5).

(21) [So MS.M. V. Shab. 114b, cur. edd. 'we were'.]

(22) R. Zera was a Babylonian who emigrated to Palestine.

(23) To warn the people to cease work, since in any case no work was done on that Friday on account of the sanctity of the Day of Atonement.

(24) Since the Day of Atonement is no less holy than the Sabbath day.

(25) The prayer of 'distinction' between a holy day and a weekday and between one holy day and another.

(26) Sc. by R. Ishmael and R. Akiba.

(27) Lit., 'there'.

(28) Shab. 114b. Now in any case both the Mishnah and the Baraita cited prove that the Day of Atonement may fall on a Sunday. How then could it be maintained that if it were to fall on a Sunday it must be postponed?

(29) Our Mishnah which implies that there is no Intermediate Sabbath every year.

(30) Who allow the addition of an extra day to Ellul to meet certain exigencies. Hence the postponement.

(31) The Baraita which implies that the Day of Atonement can fall on a Sunday.

(32) Sc. R. Meir who allows no addition of any extra day to a month to meet certain exigencies and, consequently, no postponement.

(33) I.e., if in one year it falls on a Sunday, in the next it must be on a Thursday, since the twelve months consist of 29 and 30 days alternately or  $6 \times (29 + 30) = 354$  days  $= 354/7$  weeks  $= 50$  weeks and 4 days.

(34) By the addition of an extra month.

(35) The additional intercalated month being always twenty-nine days, R.H. 6b.

(36) Against R. Aha's view (supra p. 54a) that the trumpet was sounded separately for every additional offering of the day.

(37) Ps. CIV.

(38) Ps. XCII.

(39) Since the sounding of the trumpet accompanied the singing of the Psalms.

(40) I.e., a separate Psalm for each additional offering, in the same manner as there was a separate sounding of the trumpet.

(41) The Psalm for the New Moon.

(42) The Sabbath Psalm.

(43) It is a general principle that that which has the more common incidence takes precedence over that of the less common occurrence. Why then should not the Sabbath Psalm take precedence over that of the New Moon?

(44) By the Great Beth din in Jerusalem.

(45) Not every one can see the birth of the New Moon, and the fact that its Psalm was given preference served as an assurance of the official recognition of the date.

(46) The precedence of the Psalm.

(47) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'it was taught'.

(48) The term here refers to all parts of the sacrifice.

(49) Var. lec. 'west side'.

(50) Var. lec. 'east side'. So also Maimonides.

(51) Var. lec. 'on the rim of the altar above'. V. Shek. VIII, 8.

## Sukkah 55a

and in connection with this R. Johanan stated that [the reason for this<sup>1</sup> was] that people should know that the New Moon has been fixed at its proper time? — Two distinguishing signs were made, so that some might see the one while others might see the other.<sup>2</sup>

An objection was raised<sup>3</sup> [from what] Raba b. Samuel learned: Since it might have been presumed that as the trumpet is sounded for the Sabbath on its own<sup>4</sup> and for the New Moon on its own<sup>5</sup> it is also sounded for each additional offering separately.<sup>6</sup> Scripture, therefore, teaches explicitly, And on your New Moons.<sup>7</sup> Is not this then a refutation of R. Aha? — It is indeed a refutation. But how is the inference<sup>8</sup> made? —

Abaye answered, Scripture says, 'And on your New Moons', whereby all the months are compared with one another.<sup>9</sup> R. Ashi answered, It is written, 'your month'<sup>10</sup> and it is written 'On the beginnings of.'<sup>11</sup> What month is it that has two beginnings? It is, you must say, that of the New Year,<sup>12</sup> and the Divine Law nevertheless says, 'your

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

month'<sup>10</sup> viz., that it is to be regarded as one. Moreover it has been taught: What did they recite on the first day of the Intermediate Days?<sup>13</sup> Ascribe unto the Lord, O ye sons of might.<sup>14</sup> On the second day what did they recite? But unto the wicked God saith.<sup>15</sup> On the third day what did they recite? Who will rise up for me against the evil-doers?<sup>16</sup> On the fourth day what did they recite? Consider, ye brutish among the people.<sup>17</sup> On the fifth day what did they recite? I removed his shoulder from the burden.<sup>18</sup> On the sixth day what did they recite? All the foundations of the earth are moved;<sup>19</sup> and if the Sabbath occurred on any of these days<sup>20</sup> 'are moved'<sup>21</sup> is to be superseded.<sup>22</sup>

R. Safra assigned to them<sup>23</sup> the mnemonic Humbahi.<sup>24</sup> R. Papa assigned to them the mnemonic Humhabi;<sup>25</sup> and the mnemonic for you<sup>26</sup> is 'the escort of the scribes'.<sup>27</sup> Now is not this a refutation of R. Aha b. Hanina?<sup>28</sup> — It is indeed a refutation. But did not R. Aha b. Hanina quote both a Scriptural verse and a Baraitha [in support of his view]?<sup>29</sup> —

Rabina answered, [The meaning of the Baraitha is] that the trumpet blasts are lengthened.<sup>30</sup> The Rabbis of Caesarea in the name of R. Aha<sup>31</sup> stated, It<sup>32</sup> means that the number of the trumpeters is to be increased. And we who keep two days [of the Festival], how do we proceed?<sup>33</sup> —

Abaye ruled, The [paragraph for the] second day is to be omitted.<sup>34</sup> Raba ruled, [That of] the seventh day is omitted.<sup>35</sup> It was taught in agreement with Raba: If the Sabbath falls on one of them<sup>36</sup> 'are moved'<sup>37</sup> is omitted. Amemar instituted in Nehardea<sup>38</sup> to go back and repeat the previous portions.<sup>39</sup>

- (1) The special place for the New Moon sacrificial pieces.
- (2) Lit., 'he who saw one saw it', etc.
- (3) To R. Aha's view.
- (4) Sc. when it is an ordinary Sabbath.

- (5) Sc. when it occurs on a weekday.
- (6) Even when Sabbath and New Moon occur on the same day.
- (7) Num. X, 10. This is explained presently.
- (8) From Num. X, 10 (cf. prev. n.).
- (9) Sc. whatever Festivals the day of the New Moon may have, the number of trumpet blasts is always to be the same, i.e., they are to be sounded for one additional offering only.
- (10) Num. X, 10; i.e., the written form being defective it may be rendered as a sing.
- (11) The plural form, *ibid.* E.V., 'In the beginnings of your months'.
- (12) Since its first day is both New Moon and New Year.
- (13) Of Tabernacles, when the additional sacrifice was being offered.
- (14) Ps. XXIX, 1. Sc. all the Psalm in which this verse occurs.
- (15) Ps. L, 16. Sc. the whole Psalm (cf. prev. n.).
- (16) Ps. XCIV, 16. From this verse to the end of the Psalm (Rashi).
- (17) Ps. XCIV v, 8. Sc. vv. 8-15 (Rashi).
- (18) Ps. LXXXI, 7. Sc. all the Psalm.
- (19) *Ibid.* LXXXII, 5. Sc. all the Psalm.
- (20) When Ps. XCII had to be read.
- (21) Sc. Ps. LXXXII which is allotted to the last day.
- (22) The Psalm that is superseded by the Sabbath Psalm is read on the Sunday and is followed on the subsequent days by the other Psalms in the order given, so that the Psalm for the last day is always the one completely superseded.
- (23) The Psalms mentioned.
- (24) A fictitious word composed of the first letters of the verses quoted.
- (25) Making Ps. LXXXI precede Ps. XCIV, 8-15.
- (26) To remember who made Humbahi his mnemonic, and who Humhabi.
- (27) Or 'school teachers' whose quarters are frequented by many people, men and women. Sadra is the Aramaic for 'scribe' or 'school teacher', and 'ambuha', ('an escort') is similar in sound to Humbahi. The mnemonic thus suggests that 'Safra said humbahi'.
- (28) Who ruled supra that for every additional offering of the day there were special blasts, thus requiring also special Psalms while here it is ruled that one Psalm superseded the other.
- (29) How then could such an authoritative statement be refuted?
- (30) Not as R. Aha b. Hanina interpreted it. The Baraitha merely says that 'they sound according to the additional offerings'. The explanation that it means separate blasts for each additional offering is R. Aha's alone and his own interpretation might well be refuted.
- (31) Not to be confused with R. Aha b. Hanina.



# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

(32) The Baraitha.

(33) The paragraphs of the sacrifices (v. Num. XXVIII) are to be read on the respective days. Since, owing to doubt, two days instead of one, are kept as the first day of the Festival, thus diminishing the Intermediate Days by one, which of the paragraphs is to be omitted?

(34) And the others then follow in order.

(35) That of the second to the sixth being moved one day forward.

(36) The days of Tabernacles.

(37) Sc. Ps. LXXXII, i.e., the Psalm of the seventh, which is the last day.

(38) In the case of the Pentateuchal texts dealing with the respective sacrifices on the different days of the Festival, that are included in the additional prayers of the respective days.

(39) Lit., 'to skip'. Sc. on the first day of the Intermediate Days, concerning which there is doubt whether it is the second or the third day of the Festival, the paragraphs relating to the second and the third (Num. XXIX, 17-22) are recited; on the second day which might be the third or the fourth, the paragraphs relating to the third and the fourth (ibid 20-25) are recited; on the third day, which might be the fourth or the fifth, the paragraphs relating to the fourth and fifth (ibid. 23-28) are recited, and so on. None of the paragraphs is thus omitted. This is the custom followed nowadays.

## Sukkah 55b

**MISHNAH.** ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF TABERNACLES THERE WERE OFFERED THIRTEEN BULLOCKS, TWO RAMS AND ONE HE-GOAT.<sup>1</sup> FOURTEEN HE-LAMBS<sup>2</sup> THEREFORE<sup>3</sup> REMAINED FOR THE OTHER EIGHT COURSES OF PRIESTS. ON THE FIRST DAY, SIX<sup>4</sup> OFFERED<sup>5</sup> TWO EACH AND THE REMAINING [TWO] ONE EACH.<sup>6</sup> ON THE SECOND DAY<sup>7</sup> FIVE [COURSES]<sup>8</sup> OFFERED<sup>5</sup> TWO EACH AND THE REMAINING [FOUR] ONE EACH.<sup>6</sup> ON THE THIRD DAY<sup>9</sup> FOUR [COURSES]<sup>10</sup> OFFERED TWO EACH AND THE REMAINING [SIX] ONE EACH.<sup>11</sup> ON THE FOURTH DAY<sup>12</sup> THREE<sup>13</sup> OFFERED TWO EACH AND THE REMAINING [EIGHT] ONE EACH.<sup>11</sup> ON THE FIFTH DAY<sup>12</sup> TWO<sup>13</sup> OFFERED TWO EACH AND THE REMAINING [TEN] ONE EACH.<sup>11</sup> ON THE SIXTH DAY<sup>12</sup> ONE<sup>13</sup> OFFERED TWO AND THE REMAINING [TWELVE] ONE EACH.<sup>11</sup>

ON THE SEVENTH DAY<sup>14</sup> ALL WERE EQUAL.<sup>15</sup> ON THE EIGHTH DAY<sup>16</sup> THEY AGAIN CAST LOTS<sup>17</sup> AS ON THE OTHER PILGRIM FESTIVALS. IT WAS ENJOINED THAT [THE COURSE] THAT OFFERED BULLOCKS ON ONE DAY SHOULD NOT OFFER THEM ON THE MORROW, BUT THAT THEY SHOULD TAKE THEIR TURNS IN ROTATION.<sup>18</sup>

**GEMARA.** Must we say that our Mishnah<sup>19</sup> represents the view of Rabbi, and not that of the Rabbis, since it has been taught, For the bullock which is offered on the Eighth Day lots are cast as at first,<sup>20</sup> these are the words of Rabbi, but the Sages ruled, One of the two courses which did not have a third turn in the bullocks<sup>21</sup> offered it? — You may even say that it represents the view of the Rabbis,<sup>22</sup> for do not two courses also require<sup>23</sup> the casting of lots?<sup>24</sup> Whose view is followed in that which has been taught, All the courses repeated<sup>25</sup> a second and a third time, with the exception of two courses who repeated a second time but not a third one?<sup>26</sup> Must we say that it follows that of Rabbi, and not that of the Rabbis?<sup>27</sup> — You may even say that it follows that of the Rabbis, but the statement that<sup>28</sup> they did not repeat a third time refers to the bullocks of the Festival.<sup>29</sup> What then does this<sup>30</sup> teach us?<sup>31</sup> — It is this that we were taught, that he who offered bullocks on the one day shall not offer them on the morrow, but they must all take their turns in rotation.

R. Eleazar<sup>32</sup> stated, To what do those seventy bullocks<sup>33</sup> [that were offered during the seven days of the Festival] correspond? To the seventy nations.<sup>34</sup> To what does the single bullock [of the Eighth Day] correspond? To the unique nation.<sup>35</sup> This may be compared to a mortal king who said to his servants, 'Prepare for me a great banquet'; but on the last day he said to his beloved friend, 'Prepare for me a simple meal that I may derive benefit from you'.

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

R. Johanan observed, Woe to the idolaters, for they had a loss and do not know what they have lost.<sup>36</sup> When the Temple was in existence the altar atoned for them, but now<sup>37</sup> who shall atone for them?

**MISHNAH.** AT THREE PERIODS IN THE YEAR<sup>38</sup> ALL THE COURSES OF THE PRIESTS SHARED EQUALLY IN THE FESTIVAL SACRIFICES<sup>39</sup> AND IN THE DIVISION OF THE SHOWBREAD.<sup>40</sup> ON PENTECOST<sup>41</sup> THEY USED TO SAY TO THE PRIEST,<sup>42</sup> 'HERE IS UNLEAVENED BREAD FOR YOU,<sup>43</sup> HERE IS LEAVENED BREAD'.<sup>44</sup> THE COURSE OF PRIESTS WHOSE PERIOD OF SERVICE WAS FIXED [FOR THAT FESTIVAL WEEK]<sup>45</sup> OFFERED THE DAILY OFFERING, VOW-OFFERINGS AND FREEWILL-OFFERINGS AND ALL OTHER CONGREGATIONAL OFFERINGS;<sup>46</sup> AND IT OFFERED THEM ALL.<sup>47</sup>

**GEMARA.** But are not the emurim<sup>48</sup> the Most High's?<sup>49</sup> — R. Hisda replied, [The meaning is], that which is prescribed [to be offered] on the Festivals.<sup>50</sup>

Our Rabbis taught, Whence do we know that all the courses share equally in the sacrifices of the Festival? Since Scripture explicitly stated, And come with all the desire of his soul... and minister.<sup>51</sup> As it might be said that the same applies to all the days of the year Scripture explicitly teaches 'From one of thy gates'<sup>52</sup> [meaning this:] I have said so, [saith the Lord], Only when all Israel enters<sup>53</sup> by one gate.<sup>54</sup>

**AND IN THE DIVISION OF THE SHOWBREAD.** Our Rabbis taught, Whence do we know that all the courses share equally in the division of the showbread?

- (1) As prescribed in Num. XXIX, 13 and 16, a total of sixteen beasts.
- (2) Ibid. 13.
- (3) Since there were twenty-four courses (v. Ta'an., Sonc. ed., pp. 136 and 142f) of priests all of whom were entitled to share in the Festival

sacrifices, and sixteen of these were occupied with the sixteen beasts (ct. n. 7).

- (4) Of the eight courses.
- (5) Of the fourteen lambs.
- (6) A total of fourteen.
- (7) When the number of bullocks was reduced by one (cf. Num. XXIX, 17), and only fifteen courses were occupied with the twelve bullocks, two rams and one he-goat.
- (8) Of the remaining (24 — 15 = ) 9.
- (9) When the number of bullocks was again reduced by one. From the second day to the seventh day the number was reduced by one on each successive day (v. Num. XXIX, 17-32).
- (10) Of the remaining (24 — 14 = ) 10.
- (11) A total of fourteen.
- (12) Cf. p. 267, n. 15 mut. mut.
- (13) Cf. p. 267, n. 16.
- (14) When the number of beasts, seven bullocks, two rams, fourteen he-lambs (Num. XXIX, 32) and one he-goat (ibid. 34) was equal to the number of the courses of priests.
- (15) Sc. each course offered one beast.
- (16) When there was but one bullock, one ram and seven he-lambs to be offered (Num. XXIX, 36) a number that did not suffice to provide even one beast for each course of priests.
- (17) As prescribed in Yoma 22a.
- (18) So that twenty-two of the courses had three turns with the bullocks and only two had no more than two turns (cf. Rashi a.l.).
- (19) Which states ON THE EIGHTH DAY THEY AGAIN CAST LOTS, presumably for all the twenty-four courses.
- (20) Sc. by all the twenty-four courses, as if the Festival has just begun, and not merely by those who had only two turns in the bullocks (cf. prev. n. but one).
- (21) Cf. supra n. 8.
- (22) The Sages.
- (23) To determine which of them should have the privilege of offering the bullock of the Eighth Day.
- (24) Of course they do.
- (25) The offering of a bullock during the seven days of Tabernacles.
- (26) Tosef. Suk. IV, 15.
- (27) Since according to the Rabbis, who regard the offering of the bullock of the Eighth Day as connected with the offerings on the previous seven days, only one course did not offer a third time.
- (28) Lit., 'what'.
- (29) But not to the bullock of the Eighth Day.
- (30) The statement that twenty-two repeated three times and two repeated only twice.
- (31) Is it not obvious that seventy bullocks divided among twenty-four courses means that

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

twenty-two offered three each and the remaining two courses two each?

(32) Cur. edd. in parenthesis, 'Eliezer'.

(33) Cf. prev. n. but one.

(34) Seventy is the traditional number of Gentile nations, and the seventy bullocks are offered to make atonement for them.

(35) Israel.

(36) By their destruction of the Temple.

(37) That it is no longer in existence.

(38) Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles.

(39) Sc. those prescribed for respective Festivals. The word used is Emurim which usually signifies that part of the sacrifice which is burnt upon the altar. The Gemara explains this infra.

(40) If there was a Sabbath during the Festival. Cf. Lev. XXIV, 5-9. The showbread was removed from the table and distributed among the priests on the Sabbath day (cf. Men. 52b).

(41) If it happened to be on a Sabbath.

(42) When he was given his share.

(43) Sc. showbread. The twelve loaves of the showbread were unleavened.

(44) The two loaves prescribed as a Pentecost offering. These were leavened. Each priest must receive a share from the leavened as well as from the unleavened. It is not enough to give him a larger share in the one to make up for the share due to him in the other (cf. Kid. 53a, Men. 73a).

(45) Each course officiated in turn for one week during which they offered and received the dues from all the sacrifices of that week.

(46) That have not been prescribed for the Festival. It is only in the sacrifices that were prescribed for the Festival in question that all the courses have an equal share.

(47) This apparently superfluous statement is explained in the Gemara infra.

(48) Rendered in our Mishnah SACRIFICES (cf. supra p. 269, n. 14).

(49) Burnt upon the altar. How then can they be shared among the priests?

(50) R. Hisda connects Emurim with Amur 'stated', 'declared', referring to the sacrifices prescribed to be offered by individuals on a Festival; the festive peace-offerings of the breast and shoulder belonged to the priests, and the burnt-offerings brought on appearing in the Temple of which the hide was given to the priests. V. Hag., Sonc. ed., p. 2, nn. 1-2.

(51) Deut. XVIII, 6, 7. 'Levite' in this verse refers to the priests. On all other days the offering belonged to the officiating course (cf. Lev. VII, 9).

(52) Deut. XVIII, 6; emphasis on 'one'.

(53) I.e., into the one city of Jerusalem.

(54) Sc. during the Festivals.

## Sukkah 56a

From Scripture which teaches, They shall have portion to portion to eat,<sup>1</sup> meaning, as the division of the service [is equal for all], so is the division of the food.<sup>2</sup> Now what food [could this mean]? If you will say that it means the sacrifices, do we not deduce that from a different verse,<sup>3</sup> It shall be the priest's that offers it?<sup>4</sup> Consequently<sup>5</sup> it must refer to the showbread. As one might assume that the same applies also to obligatory offerings that are offered on the Festival, though not on account of the Festival,<sup>6</sup> Scripture explicitly teaches, Except for that which is sold<sup>7</sup> according to the fathers' houses;<sup>1</sup> now what is it that the fathers have sold to each other? [The week allotted to each course, each one having agreed] 'I shall be in charge in my week and you in your week'.<sup>8</sup>

ON PENTECOST THEY USED TO SAY TO THE PRIEST, etc. It was stated, Rab ruled, [The benediction of] the Sukkah<sup>9</sup> [comes first]<sup>10</sup> and then that of the season.<sup>9</sup> Rabbah b. Bar Hana ruled, [The benediction of] the season [is first] and then that of the Sukkah. 'Rab ruled, [The benediction of] the Sukkah [comes first] and then that of the season', since the obligation of the day is more important. 'Rabbah b. Bar Hana ruled, [The benediction of] the season [is first]', since that which is more constant<sup>11</sup> precedes that which is less constant.<sup>12</sup> Must we say that Rab and Rabbah b. Bar Hana differ on the same principles as those on which Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel differed?

For our Rabbis have taught, These are the points of difference between Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel with regard to [the ritual at] a meal: Beth Shammai rule that one<sup>13</sup> recites the benediction of the day<sup>14</sup> and then the benediction over the wine, whereas Beth Hillel rule that one recites the benediction over the wine and then the benediction of the day. 'Beth Shammai rule that one

# SUCCA – 29b-56b

recites the benediction of the day and then the benediction over the wine', since it is the day which is the cause of the wine being brought,<sup>15</sup> and [moreover] the sanctification of the day comes before the wine is brought;<sup>16</sup> 'whereas Beth Hillel rule that one recites the benediction over the wine first and then the benediction of the day', since the wine is the cause of the sanctification being recited.<sup>17</sup>

Another reason: The benediction over wine is more common,<sup>18</sup> and the benediction of the day less common,<sup>19</sup> and that which is more common takes precedence over that which is less common.<sup>20</sup> Now must we say that Rab<sup>21</sup> is in agreement with Beth Shammai and Rabbah b. Bar Hana<sup>22</sup> with Beth Hillel? —

[No,] Rab can answer you, I may uphold my view even according to Beth Hillel, for Beth Hillel maintain their ruling only in that case, since the wine is the cause of the sanctification being recited, but not in this case, since even if there were no benediction of the season, do we not say [the benediction of] the Sukkah?<sup>23</sup> And Rabbah b. Bar Hana can answer you, I may maintain my view even according to Beth Shammai, for Beth Shammai gave their ruling only in that case, since it is the day which is the cause of the wine being brought, but not in this case, since even without a Sukkah do we not recite [the benediction of] the season?<sup>24</sup>

We have learnt, ON PENTECOST THEY USED TO SAY TO THE PRIEST, 'HERE IS UNLEAVENED BREAD FOR YOU, HERE IS LEAVENED BREAD'. Now here, surely, the leavened bread is the essential feature [of the Festival]<sup>25</sup> and the unleavened bread an unessential one,<sup>26</sup> and yet it teaches, 'HERE IS UNLEAVENED BREAD FOR YOU, HERE IS LEAVENED BREAD'. Is not this then a refutation of Rab?<sup>27</sup> —

Rab can answer you, This point is one in dispute between Tannas; for it has been taught [elsewhere], 'Here is unleavened bread for you, here is leavened bread'. Abba Saul, [however] stated, [They said,] 'Here is leavened bread for you, here is unleavened'.

R. Nahman b. R. Hisda expounded: The law is not according to Rab who said, [First the benediction of] the Sukkah and then [that of] the season, but first [is the benediction of] the season and then [is that of] the Sukkah. R. Shesheth the son of R. Idi however, laid down, First [the benediction of] the Sukkah and then [that of] the season; and the law is that the benediction of Sukkah is first and then follows that of the season.

THE COURSE OF PRIESTS WHOSE PERIOD OF SERVICE WAS FIXED, etc., AND ALL OTHER CONGREGATIONAL OFFERINGS. What does [this]<sup>28</sup> include? — It includes the bullock brought as a result of a transgression caused by the forgetfulness of the congregation<sup>29</sup> and the he-goats brought as an atonement for idolatry.<sup>30</sup>

AND IT OFFERED THEM ALL. What does this include? — It includes the slack season<sup>31</sup> of the altar.<sup>32</sup>

*MISHNAH.* IF A FESTIVAL FELL NEXT TO THE SABBATH, EITHER BEFORE OR AFTER IT,<sup>33</sup> ALL THE COURSES SHARED EQUALLY IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SHOWBREAD. IF ONE DAY INTERVENED BETWEEN THEM,<sup>34</sup> THE COURSE WHOSE PERIOD OF SERVICE WAS FIXED [FOR THAT WEEK] TOOK TEN [OF THE] LOAVES, WHILE THEY THAT WERE DETAINED<sup>35</sup> TOOK TWO.<sup>36</sup> ON ALL OTHER DAYS OF THE YEAR THE INCOMING COURSE TOOK SIX LOAVES AND THE OUTGOING COURSE SIX.<sup>33</sup> R. JUDAH STATED, THE INCOMING COURSE TOOK SEVEN AND THE OUTGOING FIVE.<sup>33</sup> THE

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

INCOMING COURSE DIVIDED IT IN THE NORTH, AND THE OUTGOING IN THE SOUTH.<sup>33</sup> [THE COURSE OF] BILGAH<sup>37</sup> ALWAYS DIVIDED IT IN THE SOUTH,<sup>33</sup> SINCE THEIR RING<sup>38</sup> WAS IMMOVABLE<sup>39</sup> AND THEIR ALCOVE<sup>40</sup> WAS BLOCKED UP.

**GEMARA.** What is meant by BEFORE and what by AFTER? If you will say that BEFORE refers to the First Day of the Festival and AFTER to the Last Day of the Festival,<sup>41</sup> is not then [the Sabbath referred to] the very Sabbath of the Intermediate Days? But the fact is that BEFORE refers to the Last Day of the Festival and AFTER refers to the First Day of the Festival.<sup>42</sup> What is the reason?<sup>43</sup> — Since the one course<sup>44</sup> had to arrive early<sup>45</sup> and the other had to leave late,<sup>46</sup> the Rabbis made the provision<sup>43</sup> in order that they<sup>47</sup> might have their meals together.

## IF ONE DAY INTERVENED.

- (1) Deut. XVIII, 8.
- (2) Lit., 'eating'.
- (3) Lit., 'from there'.
- (4) Lev. VII, 9, i.e., the priest who offers it is entitled to its dues.
- (5) Since it cannot refer to the ordinary sacrifices.
- (6) Obligatory offerings which happen to be offered on the Festival, but are not prescribed for the Festival.
- (7) E.V., 'his due'.
- (8) I.e., that each course shall officiate for one week in rotation. Hence it is only in the sacrifices that are specially prescribed for the Festival that all the courses have an equal share.
- (9) Cf. P.B. p. 232.
- (10) If one did not recite the benediction of the season when the Sukkah was made in consequence of which (cf. supra 46a) the benedictions of Sukkah and the season have to be recited on entering the Sukkah for the first time during the Festival.
- (11) The benediction of the season is recited at all Festivals.
- (12) That of Sukkah is recited during Tabernacles only.
- (13) In the course of the recital of the Kiddush on Friday nights (cf. P.B. p. 124).
- (14) The Sabbath.
- (15) If not for the Sabbath there would have been no need at all to bring wine.
- (16) I.e., the Sabbath is automatically sanctified at sunset.
- (17) Without it the sanctification (Kiddush) is not said.
- (18) It has to be said whenever one drinks wine.
- (19) It occurs only once in seven days.
- (20) Ber. 51b.
- (21) Who laid down that the obligation of the day is more important.
- (22) Who holds that the more constant takes precedence.
- (23) Of course we do. Hence it takes precedence on account of the precedence of the obligation of the day.
- (24) We do; and since the latter is more constant it takes precedence.
- (25) Since it is prescribed for the ritual of the day (cf. Lev. XXIII, 17).
- (26) It is the ordinary showbread of the previous Sabbath.
- (27) Since that which is constant, though unessential is mentioned first.
- (28) The addition of ALL OTHER.
- (29) V. Lev. IV, 13 — 14. If the congregation as a whole erred on the Festival through the forgetfulness of a law.
- (30) Committed during the Festival.
- (31) קייץ Lit., 'summer time' or 'summer fruit'. V. Shebu., Sonc. ed., p. 50, n. 3.
- (32) When there were not sufficient private offerings to supply the altar, freewill-offerings were offered from the public funds.
- (33) The Gemara infra explains this.
- (34) The Sabbath and the Festival.
- (35) If the Festival fell, for instance, on a Thursday, and the outgoing course instead of leaving on Friday remained over the Sabbath.
- (36) Since they could have left on the Friday which was an ordinary weekday, if they wanted.
- (37) V. I Chron. XXIV, 14.
- (38) Which was on the north side.
- (39) And useless. Twenty-four rings were attached to the floor of the Temple court, corresponding to the number of courses, to hold the necks of the animals sacrificed by each course respectively. Since Bilgah was debarred from officiating (v. infra) their ring was fixed and made immovable.
- (40) A sort of niche in which were kept the sacrificial instruments, etc. (cf. Mid. IV, 7).
- (41) I.e., the first day fell on Friday or the last day fell on Sunday.
- (42) I.e., the last day fell on Friday or the first day on Sunday. There was no Intermediate Sabbath, since the Sabbath either immediately preceded the first day or immediately followed the last.
- (43) That the outgoing course received a share in the showbread.

# SUCCAH – 29b-56b

- (44) The incoming.
- (45) Before the Sabbath.
- (46) After the Festival.
- (47) The two courses.

## Sukkah 56b

But why the extra two?<sup>1</sup> — R. Isaac answered, They were a reward for the closing of the doors.<sup>2</sup> But [why should not the outgoing course] say to the other, ‘Less for less’?<sup>3</sup> —

Abaye replied, ‘A young pumpkin [in hand] is better than a full-grown one [in the field]’.<sup>4</sup>

Rab Judah stated, In the same manners they<sup>6</sup> divided the additional offerings.<sup>7</sup>

An objection was raised: ‘The outgoing course offered the Daily Morning Sacrifice and the additional offerings, and the incoming course offered the Evening Daily Sacrifice and the censers’;<sup>8</sup> but it does not state, [does it,] that they divided the additional offerings? — That Tanna<sup>9</sup> does not deal with the question of division.

Rab objected, But the Tanna cited at the school of Samuel does deal with the question of division, and yet does not mention the division of the additional offerings, for at the school of Samuel it was taught: The outgoing course offered the Daily Morning Sacrifice and the additional offerings; the incoming course offered the Daily Evening Sacrifice and the censers; four priests entered there,<sup>10</sup> two from one course and two from the other and they divided the showbread. But it does not mention that they divided the additional offerings. Is not this a refutation of Rab Judah? It is indeed a refutation.

**THE INCOMING COURSE DIVIDED IT IN THE NORTH.** Our Rabbis taught, The incoming priests divided their shares in the north in order that it should be seen that they were the incoming course, and the

outgoing priests divided theirs in the south, so that it should be seen that they were the outgoing course.<sup>11</sup>

**[THE COURSE OF] BILGAH ALWAYS DIVIDED IT IN THE SOUTH.** Our Rabbis taught, It happened that Miriam the daughter of Bilgah<sup>12</sup> apostatized and married an officer of the Greek<sup>13</sup> kings. When the Greeks<sup>14</sup> entered the Sanctuary,<sup>15</sup> she stamped with her sandal upon the altar, crying out, ‘Lukos! Lukos!’<sup>16</sup> How long wilt thou consume Israel's money! And yet thou dost not stand by them in the time of oppression!’ And when<sup>17</sup> the Sages heard of the incident, they made her ring<sup>18</sup> immovable and blocked up her alcove.<sup>19</sup> Some however, say that the course [of Bilgah] was dilatory in coming<sup>20</sup> and [that of] Jeshebeab his brother<sup>21</sup>, entered with him and served in their stead. Although the neighbors of the wicked have no profit [from their proximity]<sup>22</sup> the neighbors of Bilgah<sup>23</sup> did have profit, since [after the imposition of the penalty, the course of] Bilgah always<sup>24</sup> divided their shares in the south, while that of his brother Jeshebeab did it<sup>25</sup> in the north.<sup>26</sup> It is well according to him who stated<sup>27</sup> that his<sup>28</sup> course was dilatory in coming, since for this reason the whole course might well be penalized; but according to him who stated<sup>29</sup> that it was Miriam the daughter of Bilgah who apostatized, do we [it may be objected] penalize [even a] father on account of his daughter? Yes, replied Abaye, as the proverb has it, ‘The talk of the child in the market-place, is either that of his father or of his mother’.<sup>30</sup> May we then penalize the whole course on account of her father or mother? —

‘Woe’, replied Abaye, ‘to the wicked, woe to his neighbor;<sup>31</sup> it is well with the righteous and well with his neighbor; as it is said, Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with him, for they shall eat the fruit of their doings’.<sup>32</sup>

# SUCCAḤ – 29b-56b

---

- (1) The question concerns R. Judah. Why, according to him, does the incoming course receive two more loaves than the outgoing one?
- (2) The incoming course had to close the Temple Gates which the outgoing course had left open.
- (3) Lit., ‘take off for take off’, sc. you take one less now and when it is your turn to go out, the next incoming course will in its turn be one less.
- (4) Proverb. Cf. ‘A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush’.
- (5) As the showbread.
- (6) The outgoing and incoming courses.
- (7) Of the Sabbath, sc. both had equal shares in the skills of the offerings.
- (8) Of frankincense. Before these were burnt the showbread could not be eaten.
- (9) Of the Baraita cited.
- (10) The Temple courtyard.
- (11) Tosef. Sukkah IV.
- (12) Of the course of Bilgah, although her father's name also might have been Bilgah (v. infra).
- (13) Sc. Syrian Greek.
- (14) Cf. prev. n.
- (15) In 168 B.C.E., during the persecutions of Antiochus IV that culminated in the same year in the Maccabean revolt. [Buchler, Priester, p. 76, n. 3 places this incident during the Roman wars, the terms Greek and Roman being frequently interchangeable in the Talmud].
- (16) \*\*, ‘Wolf’, name for the altar. [For this expression applied to the altar, with an allusion to its construction and situation rather than to its voraciousness, v. Gen. R. XCIX and Brull, Jahrbucher I, p. 63].
- (17) After the Maccabean victory.
- (18) Sc. that of her course.
- (19) The justice of the penalty is discussed infra.
- (20) When it was their turn to take charge of the Temple service.
- (21) Cf. I Chron. XXIV, 13.
- (22) Cf. ‘woe to the wicked, woe to his neighbor’ (Neg. XII, 6, Num. R. XVIII, 5 and infra).
- (23) Sc. the course of his brother Jeshebeab.
- (24) Even on entering.
- (25) Even when leaving.
- (26) Cf. Tosef. Suk. III. The north was deemed to be superior to the south.
- (27) As a reason for the penalty imposed on the course of Bilgah.
- (28) Bilgah's.
- (29) As a reason for the penalty imposed on the course of Bilgah.
- (30) Parents are held responsible for the character and upbringing of their offspring.
- (31) The neighbors of the wicked suffer with him.
- (32) Isa. III, 10. The verse is omitted in some editions since it does not conclusively prove Abaye's statement. It may have been quoted merely in order

to conclude the Tractate with a happy Scriptural verse.