

IV

BAVLI SUKKAH CHAPTER FOUR

FOLIOS 42B-50A

4:1-4

4:1

- A. [The rites of] the lulab and the willow-branch [carried by the priests around the altar, M. 5:5] are for six or seven [days].
- B. The recitation of the Hallel-Psalms and the rejoicing are for eight [days].
- C. [The requirement of dwelling in the] sukkah and the water libation are for seven days.
- D. And the flute-playing is for five or six.

M. 4:1

- A. The lulab is for seven days: How so?
- B. [If] the first festival day of the Festival coincided with the Sabbath, the lulab is for seven days.
- C. But [if it coincided] with any other day, it is for six days.

M. 4:2

- A. The willow-branch [rite] is for seven days: How so?
- B. [If] the seventh day of the willow-branch coincided with the Sabbath, the willow-branch [rite] is for seven days.
- C. But [if it coincided] with any other day, it is for six days.

M. 4:3

- A. The religious requirement of the lulab [on the Sabbath]: How so?
- B. [If] the first festival day of the Festival coincided with the Sabbath, they bring their lulabs to the Temple mount.
- C. And the attendants take them from them and arrange them on the roof of the portico.
- D. But the elders leave theirs in a special room.
- E. They teach them to make the following statement: "To whomever my lulab comes, lo, it is given to him as a gift."
- F. On the next day they get up and come along.
- G. And the attendants toss them before them.

H. They grab at lulabs and hit one another.

I. Now when the court saw that this was leading to a dangerous situation, they ordained that each and every one should take his lulab in his own home.

M. 4:4

- I.1** A. **[[If] the first festival day of the Festival coincided with the Sabbath, they bring their lulabs to the Temple mount:]** *But why [would it be forbidden to carry the lulab on the Sabbath if that does not coincide with the first day of the Festival (M. 4:2B-C)]? After all, it is merely an act of moving the object, and it should override the restrictions of the Sabbath [without the imposition of such a strict rule as is indicated by the law].*
- B. Said Rabbah, “It is indeed a precautionary decree, lest a person take the lulab in hand and go to an expert [in the laws governing the rite] so as to learn [what is to be done] **[43A]**, and, in so doing, carry the lulab for four or more cubits in the public domain [which must not be done].
- C. *“That accounts also for the rule pertaining to the shofar [which is not to be carried or blown on the Sabbath] and the scroll of Esther [which is not to be carried or read on the Sabbath].”*
- D. *If that is the operative consideration, then even when the first day [of the Festival coincides with the Sabbath], the prohibition likewise [should apply].*
- E. *As to the first day, lo, rabbis have made an ordinance covering it, requiring that the rite be performed at home [M. 4:41] [and the possibility of law-violation then does not exist].*
- F. *That solves the problem, to be sure, for the period after the ordinance [to which M. 4:41 refers] had been laid down, but what is there to say about the situation prior to that ordinance?*
- G. *As to conduct on the first day of the Festival, which is governed by the authority of the Torah-law so that even in the outlying areas [not in the Temple], taking the lulab is done on the authority of the Torah, rabbis made no such decree.*
- H. *But as to the other days, on which taking the lulab in the outlying areas is not done on the authority of the law of the Torah, the rabbis made their precautionary decree [even pertaining to the Temple].*
- I. *If that is the operative consideration, then at the present time also [the law should be the same]. [Slotki, p. 195, n. 8: The command to take the lulab should override on the first day the Sabbath even now when the Temple is no longer in existence.]*
- J. *We [in Babylonia] are not able precisely to establish the lunar calendar [and so do not know for sure that, in taking up the lulab on the Sabbath day, we are not violating the sanctity of the Sabbath without proper justification].*
- K. *If that is the case, then, since they [in the Land] are precise in setting the lunar calendar, for them [in the Land of Israel] the taking of the lulab should surely override the restrictions on the Sabbath.*
- L. *That is indeed the case, for we learn in the Mishnah: **If the first festival day of the Festival coincided with the Sabbath, all the people bring their lulabs to the Temple mount [M. 4:4B].***

- M. *A further version of the matter on Tannaite authority states: “to the synagogue.”*
- N. *That would then produce the inference that in the one case we speak of the age in which the Temple stood [that is, at M. 4:4B], while in the other case [M] we speak of the age in which the Temple is no longer standing.*
- O. *That inference indeed emerges.*
- I.2.** A. *How do we know that taking the lulab on the Sabbath in the outlying districts is done on the authority of the Torah?*
- B. *It is in accord with that which is taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *“And you shall take” (Lev. 23:40) — indicating that the act of taking should be carried out by each and every one.*
- D. *“For yourselves” — something that belongs to you, excluding one that is borrowed or stolen.*
- E. *“On the day” (Lev. 23:40) — even if it is the Sabbath.*
- F. *“First” — even in the outlying districts.*
- G. *“The first” — This teaches that doing so overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath only on the first festival day of the Festival alone.*

We now have two systematic amplifications of the composition at No. 2.

- I.3.** A. *A master has said, “On the day ...” — even if it is the Sabbath.’*
- B. *But it is merely an act of moving the object [and it should override the restrictions of the Sabbath]. Is a verse of Scripture really required to permit carrying on that occasion?”*
- C. *Said Raba, “It is necessary to produce such a verse only with respect to carrying, in addition, the things that are used in connection with the carrying of the lulab [but not the lulab itself].*
- D. *“And the proof text is required in accord with the view of the Tannaite authority who stands behind the following teaching of Tannaite origin:*
- E. *““Carrying not only the lulab but also whatever is needed in connection with it overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer.”*
- F. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Eliezer?*
- G. *Scripture has said, “On the day ...” even if it is the Sabbath.*
- H. *And as to rabbis [who reject Eliezer’s position], how do they deal with the phrase, “On the day ...”?*
- I. *They require that phrase to prove the proposition:*
- J. *“By day” — and not by night. [The lulab is taken by day but not by night.]*
- K. *And how does R. Eliezer prove the same point?*
- L. *He derives the same proposition from the end of the verse at hand, as follows:*
- M. *“And you shall rejoice before the Lord your God for seven days” (Lev. 23:40) — days, not nights.*
- N. *And as to rabbis?*

- O. *If the proof derived from that verse, I might have reached the false conclusion that I should derive the sense of the word “days” from the use of the word “days” in connection with dwelling in the sukkah itself.*
- P. Just as the use of the word “days” in that latter connection means that even the nights are involved, so the word “days” used in the present connection likewise means that the nights are involved. [To avoid reaching that incorrect conclusion, rabbis will not invoke the proof-text at hand to demonstrate the point they wish to make.]

I.4. A. [Continuing in a secondary development of the foregoing proof:]
And as to the sukkah itself, how do we know [that the word “days” encompasses even the nights, so that one must dwell in the sukkah both by day and by night]?

- B. *It is in line with that which rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “You shall dwell in sukkot for seven days” (Lev. 23:42) — “days” means, “and even nights.”
- D. You say that days means, “And even nights.” But perhaps the sense is “days and not nights.”
- E. It [D] is a matter of logic. Here the word “days” is used, and the word “days” is used in connection with the lulab.
- F. Just as in that latter context, the sense is that the lulab is to be carried by day but not by night, so here too the sense should be that people must dwell in sukkot by day and not by night.
- G. Or take the following route: Here it is stated, “Days.” In connection with [the seven days of] consecrating [the priesthood] the word “days” is used.
- H. Just as in that latter case, when [at Lev. 8A:35] the word “days” appears, it means, “even the nights,” so here too the word “days” means “and even the nights.”
- I. Let us then see which analogy applies.
- J. We should reason concerning a matter the religious requirement of which applies all day long, from another matter the religious requirement of which applies all day long, but let not proof derive from a matter the religious requirement of which applies for only a single hour [namely, the lulab, which is properly dealt with in a brief span of time. People do not have to carry the lulab around all day long.]
- K. Alternatively let us derive the analogy from something the religious requirement of which applies for all generations [that is, the taking of the lulab, the dwelling in the sukkah] from another matter the religious requirement of which applies for all generations. But let not the rite of consecration of the priesthood provide the governing analogy, for that rite does not apply for all generations [but only for the very first act of consecrating the priestly caste, in the time of Aaron].

- L. Scripture twice states, [43B] “You shall dwell” (Lev. 23:42) so as to provide grounds for constructing an analogy.
- M. Here “You shall dwell” is stated, and with regard to the rite of consecration of the priesthood, “You shall dwell” is used [at Lev. 8:33, 35].
- N. Just as in that latter case, when the word “days” is used, it encompasses even the nights, so here too, when the word “days” is used, it encompasses even the nights.

We now pursue the same exegetical problem for the clause under discussion that we raised in the foregoing composite for the prior clause.

II.1 A. The willow-branch rite is for seven days: How so [M. 4:2A]:

- B. *As to conducting the rite of the willow-branch on the Sabbath if that day coincides with the seventh day of the Festival why should the rite on that day override the restrictions of the Sabbath?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “It serves to make it public that the rite derives from the authority of the Torah [and so is carried out when the seventh day of the Festival coincides with the Sabbath. Thus overriding the rules of the Sabbath constitutes a demonstration that the rite itself rests upon scriptural authority].”
- D. *If that is the case, why not carry the lulab on the Sabbath even when the first day of the Festival does not coincide with the Sabbath, as a means of publicizing the fact that carrying the lulab is done on the authority of the Torah?*
- E. *The lulab is not carried on the intermediate days when they coincide with the Sabbath on account of the present precautionary decree made for the reasons given by Rabbah.*
- F. *If that is the case, should we not make an equivalent decree governing the rite of the willow-branch?*
- G. *In the case of the rite of the willow-branch, agents of the court are the ones who bring the necessary willow-branches [and they will not make an error], while, as to the lulab, the task of bringing it is given over to everyone [and the concern of Rabbah is well justified in such a situation].*
- H. *If it is the case [that the willow is taken all seven days of the Festival on the authority of the Torah], then let the willow-rite override the Sabbath, whatever day it falls [and not only on the seventh occasion of performing the rite, as M. 4:3B has specified].*
- I. *[If such favor were shown to the willow-rite] then people would imagine that the basis for carrying the lulab [not accorded similar recognition] was dubious.*
- J. *But [at least] let the willow-rite override the restrictions of the Sabbath on the first day of the Festival [as is the case with the lulab that overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, [and the willow is there only because it is part of the lulab, not because of the willow-rite itself].*
- L. *But why then should the willow-rite not override the restrictions of the Sabbath on any of the other days [apart from the seventh? Why should we rule that the willow-rite overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath only when the seventh time the rite is done and the Sabbath coincide?]*

- M. *Once you have removed the rite from the first day [of the festival, should it coincide with the Sabbath], you might as well reset it at the seventh occasion for doing the rite [even if it should coincide with the Sabbath].*
- N. *If that is the operative consideration, then at the present time, why should [the willow-rite] not override the restrictions of the Sabbath [when the seventh occasion of the rite coincides with the Sabbath]?*
- O. *The reason is that we are not able precisely to establish the lunar calendar [as above].*
- P. *If that is the case, then since they [in the Land of Israel] are precise in setting the lunar calendar, the rite should override the restrictions of the Sabbath.*
- Q. *When Bar Hadeh came, he said, "It never happened." [Slotki, p. 199, n. 3: 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.]*
- R. *When Rabin and all those who go down [from the Land of Israel] came, they said, "It did actually happen, and [the rite of the willow] did not override the restrictions of the Sabbath."*
- S. *Then is there not a question [as proposed just now at L]?*
- T. *Said R. Joseph, "Who will tell us that the rite of the willow-branch is done by taking it up [which would involve overriding the restrictions of the Sabbath]? Perhaps it is done by setting up [the willow along the sides of the altar, and that can be done in advance of the Sabbath]."*
- U. *Abbaye objected to this explanation, "The rites of the lulab and the willow-branch are for six or seven days [M. 4:1A].*
- V. *"Does this not yield the comparison of the rite of the willow branch to that of the lulab? Just as the rite of the lulab is carried out by taking the lulab in hand [which then means the rite must override the restrictions of the Sabbath], so the rite of the willow branch must be carried out by taking the willow branch in hand [not just setting it up by the altar]?"*
- W. *What makes you say so? This rite is done in accord with its rule, and that one in accord with its rule.*
- X. *Abbaye objected, "Every day they walk around the altar one time ... and on that day [the seventh day of the willow-branch] they walk around the altar seven times [M. 4:5D, F].*
- Y. *"Is this not done while carrying the willow-branch?"*
- Z. *No, it is done while carrying the lulab.*
- AA. *And lo, R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbahu said, "It is done with the willow-branch."*
- BB. *He said to him, "He may have told you that it is done with the willow-branch, but I maintain that it is done with the lulab."*
- CC. *It has been stated on Amoraic authority:*
- DD. *R. Eleazar says, "It is done carrying the lulab."*
- EE. *R. Samuel bar Nathan said R. Hanina [said], "It is done with the willow branch."*

- FF. And so R. Nahman said Rab bar bar Abbuha said, "It is done with the willow branch."
- GG. *Said Raba to R. Isaac, son of Rabbah bar bar Hanan, "True son of Torah, come and let me tell you a lovely teaching that your father said:*
- HH. *"Lo, as to that which we have learned in the Mishnah: Every day they walk around the altar one time and on that day they walk around the altar seven times [M. 4:5D, F], this is what your father said in the name of R. Eleazar, 'It is done with the lulab.'"*
- II. *It was objected:*
- JJ. **The rite of the lulab overrides the prohibitions of the Sabbath at the beginning of the Festival of Sukkot [that is, when the Sabbath coincides with the first festival day of Sukkot], and the rite of the willow branch at the end [when the rite of the willow branch carried out for the seventh time is supposed to be done on the Sabbath].**
- KK. **One time the seventh occasion for the rite of the willow branch coincided with the Sabbath, so people brought on the eve of the Sabbath willow saplings and left them in the courtyard.**
- LL. **The Boethusians found out about them and took them and hid them under boulders.**
- MM. **The next day the common folk found out about the matter and dragged the branches out from under the stones and the priests brought them, and they set them up around the altar.**
- NN. **The Boethusians did this because they did not concede that the rite of beating the willow branches against the altar overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath [T. Suk. 3:1A-E].**
- OO. *What follows from this passage is that the rite of the willow branch is carried out by taking the willow branch itself.*
- PP. *That refutes the proposition under discussion.*
- QQ. *Why, then should taking the willow on the seventh day of the Festival not override the Sabbath [in the Land of Israel, where the lunar calendar is accurately reported]?*
- RR. *Since we [in Babylonia] do not overlook the restrictions of the Sabbath in connection with that rite they too will not overlook those restrictions.*
- SS. *But what about the first day of the Festival, on which, for us, we do not overlook the restrictions of the Sabbath [for we do not take up the lulab on that day], while they do overlook the restrictions of the Sabbath and take up the lulab?*
- TT. **[44A] Say: For them [in the Land of Israel] the restrictions of the Sabbath should not be set aside.**
- UU. *But then these two Tannaite teachings contradict one another.*
- VV. *One maintains the wording, All the people bring their lulabs to the Temple Mount [M. 4:4B] and the other phrases matters, "... to the synagogue."*
- WW. *Now we replied, "The one speaks of the time in which the house of the sanctuary stood, the other when it is no longer standing."*

XX. *That is not the case. Both passages refer to the time that the house of the sanctuary was standing, but, nonetheless, there is still no contradiction. One speaks of the sanctuary, the other of how matters are done in outlying districts.*

II.2. A. *Said Abbayye to Raba, "How is it the case that, in respect to the lulab, we do carry out the rite for seven days as a memorial to the Temple, while in the case of the willow-rite, we do not carry out the rite for seven days as a memorial to the sanctuary [since the willow rite is carried out nowadays for only one day]?"*

B. *He said to him, "It is because a man fulfills his obligation by means of the willow-branch that is contained in the lulab in any event [so there is no need for a further such commemoration with the willow-branch]."*

C. *He said to him, "But that is done on account of the lulab itself [and not for the express purpose of making use of the willow-branch in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple]."*

D. *"And if you should maintain that one lifts up the lulab one time [in regard to the lulab] and yet another time [in regard to the willow-branch], but lo, there are occasions every day on which we do not do things that way."*

E. *[Replying to the original question,] said R. Zebid in the name of Raba, "As to the lulab, which is carried on the authority of the Torah, we make use of the object for seven days as a memorial to the sanctuary."*

F. *"As to the willow-branch, which rests only upon the authority of rabbis, we do not carry out the rite for seven days as a memorial to the sanctuary."*

II.3. A. *In accord with whom [is the view that the authority of the rite of the willow-branch is only rabbinical and not derived from the Torah]?*

B. *Of one should propose that it accords with Abba Saul, has he not said, the following:*

C. *"'Willows of the brook' (Lev. 23:40 [in the plural] indicates that there are two, one to be used in the lulab, the other to be used in the rite of the sanctuary [and both, then, deriving from the authority of Scripture]."*

D. *Nor could it be in accord with the view of rabbis, for, in their view, it is a law transmitted [from Sinai, and hence enjoying the same standing as Torah-law].*

E. *For R. Assi said R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Nehunia of the Plain of Bet Hawartan, "The laws governing the ten plants the willow-branch and the water-offering [of the rite of the Festival] constitute laws revealed to Moses from Sinai [as explained above, 34A]."*

F. *But, said R. Zebid in the name of Raba, "In the case of the lulab, which enjoys a foundation in the authority of the Torah for its utilization on the first day of the Festival which coincides with the Sabbath even in the outlying districts, we carry it for seven days as a memorial to the sanctuary."*

G. *"In the case of the willow-branch, which does not enjoy a foundation in the authority of the Torah for its utilization in the outlying districts, we do not carry it for seven days as a memorial to the sanctuary."*

II.4. A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "Blemished priests [who may not ordinarily serve] may enter the area between the hall [leading to the interior of the Temple (Slotki)] and the altar so as to carry out the religious duty of the willow-branch."*

- B. *“Said R. Yohanan to him, “Who said this?”*
- C. *Who said it? He is the very one who said it, for R. Assi said R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Nehunia of the Plain of Bet Hawartan, “The laws governing the ten plants, the willow-branch, and the water-offering [of the rite of the Festival] constitute laws revealed to Moses from Sinai.”*
- D. *But [the issue is], who said that this is done by actually taking up the willow? Perhaps it is done by standing them up [by the altar].*
- E. *Who has made this statement with reference, in particular, to blemished priests? Perhaps it applies to unblemished ones alone.*

II.5. A. *It has been stated on Amoraic authority:*

- B. R. Yohanan and R. Joshua b. Levi —
- C. One of them said, “The rite of the willow-branch is an institution established by the prophets.”
- D. The other said, “The rite of the willow-branch is a mere custom carried on by the prophets.”
- E. *You may conclude that it is R. Yohanan who has said that the rite of the willow branch is an institution established by the prophets.*
- F. For R. Abbahu said R. Yohanan said, “The rite of the willow-branch is an institution established by the prophets.”
- G. *You may indeed reach that conclusion.*
- H. Said R. Zira to R. Abbahu, “Did R. Yohanan make such a statement at all?”
- I. “And has not R. Yohanan said in the name of R. Nehunia of the Plain of Bet Hawartan, ‘The laws governing the ten plants, the willow-branch, and the water offering [of the rite of the Festival] constitute laws revealed to Moses from Sinai.’”
- J. He was struck dumb for a moment, and then he said, “The laws were forgotten and the prophets came along and reestablished them.”
- K. *But did R. Yohanan maintains that [laws were forgotten during the exile in Babylonia]?*
- L. *And did not R. Yohanan say, “As to what is yours that I have reported, in fact it belongs to them. [Slotki, p. 203, n. 12: The knowledge of the Law which he first thought was the possession of the Palestinians was in fact in the hands of the Babylonians. How then could it be said that he held that the Torah was forgotten during the Babylonian exile?]”*
- M. *There is no contradiction. [44B] In the one case we speak of the rite carried on in the sanctuary [and that is a law Moses received at Sinai], in the other, the practice of the rite in the outlying districts [and that is what only the prophets instituted].*

II.6. A. Said R. Ammi, “As to the willow-branch, it is subject to a minimum measure.

- B. “It may be taken only by itself.
- C. “A person does not carry out his obligation [to take up the willow branch] by doing so with the willow-branch that is in the lulab.”
- D. *Since the cited authority [Ammi] has said that it may be taken only by itself [and not in conjunction with other species], is it not self-evident that a person does not carry out his obligation by doing so with the willow-branch that is in the lulab?*

- E. *What might you have said? The former rule applies only to a case in which the householder did not lift up the lulab, containing the willow-branch, and then go and lift it up a second time [thus once for the lulab, inclusive of the willow-branch, the other time for the willow-branch on its own]. But in a case in which one has lifted up the lulab and then gone and done so a second time, I might have said that that is not the case.*
- F. *So we are informed that we make no such supposition.*
- G. And R. Hisda said R. Isaac [said], "A person does carry out his obligation [to take up the willow-branch] by doing so with the willow-branch that is in the lulab."
- H. And what is the minimum measure for the lulab [A]?
- I. Said R. Nahman, "It must have three twigs with fresh leaves."
- J. And R. Sheshet said, "Even one leaf and one twig."
- K. "One leaf and one twig?!" *How can you think so?*
- L. Rather, I should phrase matters, "Even one leaf on one twig."

- II.7.** A. *Said Aibu, "I was standing before R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq, and someone brought a willow-branch to him. He took it and shook it and did so again, but did not say a blessing.*
- B. *"He took the position that the matter is simply a custom that the prophets introduced."*
 - C. *Aibu and Hezekiah, sons of the daughter of Rab, brought a willow-branch before Rab. He beat it and did so again, but he did not say a blessing over it.*
 - D. *He took the position that the matter is simply a custom that the prophets introduced.*

A separate composition is joined to the foregoing because of the obviously shared attributive program.

- E. *Said Aibu, "I was standing before R. Eleazar b. R. Sadoq, and someone came to him and said to him, 'I own villages, vineyards, and olive groves. The villagers come and hoe in the vineyards, and [as payment] they eat the olives [and this is done in the Seventh Year, when the land is treated as if it is ownerless.]'*
- F. *"Is this proper or improper [for them to take as payment for hoeing the vineyards the olives that they eat]?"*
- G. *"He said to him, 'It is not proper.'*
- H. *"As the man was leaving, [Eleazar] said, 'I have been living in this land for forty years, and I have never seen a man walking in the right paths the way this one does.'*
- I. *"The man came back and said to him, 'What should I do?'*
- J. *"He said to him, 'Declare the olives to be ownerless property for those in need, and pay money for those who do the hoeing.'"*
- K. *Now it is permitted to hoe [in the Seventh Year]?*
- L. *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- M. *"But the seventh year you shall let [the land] rest and lie still" (Exo. 23:11).*
- N. *"You shall let it rest" from hoeing,*

- O. "and lie still" from having stones removed.
- P. *Said R. Uqba bar Hama, "There are two kinds of hoeing. In one kind one closes up the holes [around the roots of a tree], and in the other, he aerates the soil [around the roots of a tree]."*
- Q. *"Aerating the soil is forbidden, closing up the holes is permitted [since the former serves the roots of the tree, the latter merely protects the tree (Slotki)]."*
- R. Said Aibu in the name of R. Eleazar bar Sadok, "A person should not walk on the eve of the Sabbath [Friday] more than three parasangs [for fear he may not reach his destination prior to the Sabbath]."
- S. *Said R. Kahana, "The statement at hand applies only to someone going home [where people might have food ready for him, if he is not expected]. But as to going to his inn, he depends upon what he has in hand [for food, so there is no problem]."*
- T. *There are those who report matters as follows:*
- U. *Said R. Kahana, "The statement at hand was necessary only to apply even to one who was going to his home."*
- V. *Said R. Kahana, "Such an incident happened to me, and [at home] I did not find even a fish-pie [because I came in unexpectedly]."*

III.1 A. The religious requirement of the lulab on the Sabbath: how so [M. 4:4A]:

- B. *A Tannaite teacher repeated the following Tannaite teaching before R. Nahman: They arrange them on the roof of the portico [M. 4:4C].*
- C. *He said to him, [45A] "But do they have to dry them out [that they should be arranged up there? [If they dry out, the lulabs are invalid.]"*
- D. *But say, "... on the portico."*
- E. *Said Rahba said R. Judah, "The Temple Mountain had a double colonnade, one within the other."*

M. 4:2 and M. 4:3 take up the items of M. 4:1A and explain why they may be done either on six or on seven days. Only if the first festival day of the Festival coincides with the Sabbath are these rites carried out on the Sabbath. If the first festival day of the Festival is on any other day, then for the Sabbath which falls in the intermediate days of the festival these rites are suspended (compare M. 3:12). That is the point repeated at M. 4:2 and M. 4:3. It will not be relevant to M. 4:1B or C, since there is no problem with the Sabbath for these rites, or to M. 4:1D, because there is no basis for permitting the flute-playing to override the restrictions of the Sabbath in any event. The supplement at M. 4:4, to M. 4:2 goes over the ground of M. 3:12-13. The narrative is complete at B-F +G. H-I are jarring, just as the consideration of E is surprising in light of the certainty of M. 3:13 on a quite different theory. In all, this is an odd item, contradicting M. 3:12 at I and M. 3:13 at E-F. Unit I:1 proceeds directly to the issue of not carrying the lulab on the Sabbath when the Sabbath and the first day of the Festival do not coincide, that is, the premise of the entire construction. Unit I:2 is continuous with the foregoing, I G. Unit I:3 still goes over the same issue, and unit I:4 is continuous with the foregoing, supplementing and completing its discussion. Unit II:1 moves us to M.

4:2 and seeks the needed proof for the law. The issue of the basis for the rite of the willow-branch, and its relationship to the rite of the lulab, persists to the end. Unit II:2 reverts back to the issue of the memorial to the destroyed sanctuary, accomplished with the latter and not the former, and explains why that is the case. Since Aibu-Eleazar b. R. Sadoq stands at the head of the lot, other materials, not relevant to the opening issue, are gathered together, which indicated that the materials were formed as a unit around the name of the authority at hand, not the Mishnah-paragraph under discussion. Unit III:1 then proceeds to M. 4:4A.

4:5-7

- A. The religious requirement of the willow-branch: How so?
- B. There was a place below Jerusalem, called Mosa. [People] go down there and gather young willow-branches. They come and throw them up along the sides of the altar, with their heads bent over the altar.
- C. They blew on the shofar a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained note.
- D. Every day they walk around the altar one time and say, “save now, we beseech thee, O Lord! We beseech thee, O Lord, send now prosperity (Psa. 118:25).”
- E. R. Judah says, “[They say], ‘Ani waho, save us we pray! Ani waho, save us we pray!’”
- F. And on that day [the seventh day of the willow-branch] they walk around the altar seven times.
- G. When they leave, what do they say?
- H. “Homage to you, O altar! Homage to you, O altar!”
- I. R. Eliezer says, “For the Lord and for you, O altar! For the Lord and for you, O altar!”

M. 4:5

- A. As the rite concerning it [is performed] on an ordinary day, so the rite concerning it [is performed] on the Sabbath.
- B. But they would gather [the willow-branches] on Friday and leave them in the gilded troughs [of water], so that they will not wither.
- C. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “They would bring palm tufts and beat them on the ground at the side of the altar,
- D. “and that day was called the ‘day of beating palm tufts.’”

M. 4:6

- A. They take their lulabs from the children’s hands and eat their citrons.

M. 4:7

I.1 A. [There was a place below Jerusalem, called Mosa:] *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. [The place named at M. 4:5B] was Kolonia.
- C. As to the Tannaite authority at hand, why does he call it Mosa?
- D. Since it was exempt from the royal tax, he calls it Mosa [removed, that is, removed from the tax rolls].

II.1 A. They come and throw them up along the sides of the altar, with their heads bent over the altar [M. 4:5B]:

- B. *A Tannaite statement:*
- C. They [willows] were sizable and long, eleven cubits high, so that they would bend over the altar by one cubit.
- D. *Said Maremar in the name of Mar Zutra, "That statement implies that people would leave them at the base of the altar [but not on the ground]."*
- E. *"For if you should imagine that they left them on ground, [take note of the following]: [The altar] rose by one cubit and drew in by one cubit [on every side]. This is the foundation ... It rose by five cubits and drew in by one cubit. This is the circuit [M. Mid. 3:1B-F]. It rose three cubits, and this was the place of the horns [Cf. M. Mid. 3:1H]."*
- F. *"Now how then can the willows have bent over the altar [if they were set on the ground? [Slotki, p. 208, n. 6: 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?]*
- G. *"Does this not imply that the people placed them at the base of the altar [and not on the ground]?"*
- H. *It does indeed bear that implication.*
- I. *Said R. Abbahu, "What verse of Scripture makes that same point [that the boughs bent over the altar]? It is as it is said, 'Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto the horns of the altar' (Psa. 118:27). [Slotki, p. 208, n. 9: 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.]"*

II.2. A. Said R. Abbahu said R. Eleazar, "Whoever takes up a lulab with its binding and a willow-branch with its wreath is regarded by Scripture as if he had built an altar and sacrificed an offering on it.

- B. *"For it is said [45B] 'Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto the horns of the altar' (Psa. 118:27)."*
- C. *Said R. Jeremiah in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, and R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon of Mahoz in the name of R. Yohanan of Makkut, "Whoever makes an addition [Slotki] to the festival by eating and drinking is regarded by Scripture as if he had built an altar and sacrificed an offering on it.*
- D. *"For it is said, 'Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto the horns of the altar' (ps. 118:27)."*

The next item comments on the procedure laid out in the Mishnah, though it is framed in abstract terms.

II.3. A. Said Hezekiah said R. Jeremiah in the name R. Simeon b. Yohai, "In the case of things used in carrying out any and all religious duties, a person is able to fulfill his obligation only by using those objects in the manner in which they grow [with the natural bottom at the bottom, the natural top of the top],

- B. “as it is said, ‘Acacia wood standing up,’ (Exo. 26:15).”
- C. *It has been taught along these same lines on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “Acacia wood standing up” (Exo. 26:15) means that the wood is arranged so that it stands up in the manner in which it grows [with the grain perpendicular to the ground].
- E. Another interpretation: “Standing” in the sense that they had up[right] the golden plating [that is affixed to them].
- F. Another interpretation of “Standing:”
- G. Should you say, “Their hope is lost, their prospects null,” Scripture to the contrary says, “Acacia wood standing up” (Exo. 26:15), meaning that they stand for ever and ever.

The set of Hezekiah-Jeremiah-Simeon b. Yohai sayings continues its own way; the whole was formed prior to insertion here, where only a single part pertains. It would be quite routine for the elements to be rearranged so that the pertinent one appeared at the head of a list inserted in a given context, another at the head in some other context. I treat the whole as subordinate, however, in the notion that the framers of our composite selected only one part and allowed the rest to make an appearance for reasons of completeness only. We note that the set of sayings contains its own Talmud, from J; this too clearly reached closure prior to inclusion here.

- H. And Hezekiah said R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “[Because of the troubles I have known], I can free the entire world from punishment from the day on which I was born to this very moment, and were my son, Eliezer with me, it would be from the day on which the world was made to this moment, and were Yotam b. Uzziah with us, it would be from the day on which the world was made to its very end.”
- I. And Hezekiah said R. Jeremiah said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “I have myself seen the inhabitants of the upper world, and they are only a few. If they are a thousand, my son and I are among their number. If they are only a hundred, my son and I are among their number. If they are only two, they are only my son and I.”
 - J. *But are they so few in number? And lo, Raba said, “The row [of the righteous] before the Holy One, blessed be he, is made up of eighteen thousand,*
 - K. “as it is said, ‘There shall be eighteen thousand round about’ (Eze. 48:35).”
 - L. *There is [few] no contradiction [between the two views]. The former number refers to those [few] who see Him through a bright mirror, the latter [larger] number, through a dirty mirror.*
 - M. *But are those who see him through a bright mirror so few? And has not Abbayye said, “There are in the world never fewer than thirty-six righteous men who look upon the face of the Presence of God every day.*
 - N. “For it is said, ‘Happy are those who wait for him’ (Isa. 30:18), and the numerical value of the letters in the word ‘for him’ is thirty-six”?

- O. *There is no contradiction. The latter number [thirty-six] speaks of the ones who may come in with permission, the former [two, Simeon and his son] are the ones who may come in without even asking for permission].*

III.1 A. When they leave, what do they say [M. 4:5G]:

- B. *And lo, [in saying, “For the Lord and for you, O altar” [M. 4:5I], they will be joining the Name of heaven and something else.*
- C. *And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Whoever [in seeking salvation] joins the Name of heaven and something else will be uprooted from the world,*
- D. *as it is said, “Except for the Lord entirely by himself” (Exo. 22:19).*
- E. *This is the sense of the statement: “To the Lord we give thanks and to you [O altar] we give praise, to the Lord we give thanks, and to you we give homage.”*

IV.1 A. As the rite concerning it is performed on an ordinary day, so the rite concerning it is performed on the Sabbath [M. 4:6A-B]:

- B. Said R. Huna, “What is the scriptural basis for the rule [involving a distinct rite of the lulab performed at the altar] as framed by R. Yohanan b. Beroqah [M. 4:6C-D]
- C. “It is because the word for branches is written in the plural [at Lev. 23:40], thus indicating that there are to be willows, one for the lulab and the other for use in beating on the altar [as at M. 4:6C].
- D. “*But rabbis point out that the word is written defectively [without the customary signification of the plural, hence only a single one is involved].*”
- E. R. Levi says, “The matter is compared to a date-palm. Just as a date palm has only one heart, so Israel has only one heart — for their Father in heaven.”

IV.2. A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “[A blessing is said over] the lulab for seven days but for the sukkah only one [the first day of the festival].

- B. *“What is the reason for this distinction?*
- C. *“In the case of the lulab, the nights [on which the lulab is not taken up] break up the days, so that taking up the lulab each day constitutes the commission of a distinct religious duty.*
- D. *“But in case of the sukkah, in which the nights do not form divisions between the days [since the sukkah is to be used by night as much as by day], all seven days are regarded as a single protracted interval of one day.”*
- E. And Rabbah bar bar Hana said R. Yohanan said, “The sukkah is to be given a blessing seven days, but the lulab only one.
- F. *“What is the reason for this distinction?*
- G. *“The sukkah derives use of the sukkah for seven days derives from the authority of the Torah.*
- H. *“But use of the lulab for the other days of the Festival derives only from the authority of a rabbis, so saying a blessing only on the first day is entirely sufficient.”*
- I. When Rabin came, he said R. Yohanan [said], “The same rule applies to both this and that: the blessing is to be said all seven days.”

- J. *Said R. Joseph, "Select the position stated by Rabbah bar bar Hana, for all the Amoraic authorities stand with him in respect to the sukkah [and insist that a blessing be said all seven days]."*
- K. *The following objection was raised: [46A] One who makes a lulab for himself says, "Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...], who gave us life and preserved us and brought us to this occasion." When he takes it [in hand] to carry out his obligation, he says, "Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...] who has sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us concerning the taking of the lulab." And though he has said a blessing on the first day, he just recite the benediction over [the lulab] all seven [days of the festival]. [B. omits:] One who performs any of the commandments must recite a benediction over them. One who makes a sukkah for himself says, "Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...] who has brought us to this occasion." [One who] enters to dwell in it says, "Praised [be Thou, O Lord ...] [who has sanctified us through his commandments and commanded us to dwell in the sukkah." Once he recites a benediction over it on the first day, he need not recite the benediction again [or remaining days of the festival] [T. Ber. 6:10, 6:9, trans. T. Zahavy].*
- L. *There is a contradiction between one statement and another on the lulab [for Rabbah b. b. Hana wants the benediction for the lulab only on the first day, not all seven] and likewise between the two statements on the sukkah [since Rabbah b. b. Hana requires a blessing over the sukkah all seven days and the cited passage of Tosefta has the blessing only on the first day].*
- M. *Now indeed there really is no contradiction between the two statements concerning the lulab, since the one [requiring a daily blessing] refers to the time in which the house of the sanctuary was standing, the other to the time when the house of the sanctuary was no longer standing.*
- N. *But there really is a disagreement between the two statements concerning the sukkah.*
- O. *It in fact represents a point under dispute among Tannaite authorities.*
- P. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. *"As to the phylacteries, every time one puts them on, he must say a blessing over them," the words of Rabbi.*
- R. *And sages say, "One says a blessing only when he puts them on in the morning alone. [Later on in the day he need not do so]."*
- S. *It has been stated on Amoraic authority:*
- T. *Abbaye says, "The decided law accords with the view of Rabbi. "*
- U. *And Raba said, "The decided law accords with the view of rabbis. "*
- V. *Said R. Mari, son of the daughter of Samuel, "I saw that Raba did not in fact act in accord with his own tradition [that one says the blessing only once]. Rather, he would get up early and go into the privy, then come out and wash his hands, and only then put on his phylacteries, and say the requisite blessing.*
- W. *"But if he should need to make use of the privy again during the day, he would go into the privy and come out and wash his hands and put on his phylacteries and say another blessing.*

- X. *“And we too act in accord with the view of Rabbi and say a blessing [for the sukkah] all seven days.”*
- Y. *Said Mar Zutra, “I saw R. Pappi, who would say a blessing every time he put on his phylacteries.”*
- Z. *Rabbis of the household of R. Ashi, whenever they touched them, would say a blessing for them.*

- IV.3.** A. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The religious duty of taking the lulab applies all seven days.”
- B. And R. Joshua b. Levi said, “On the first day it is a religious duty to take up the lulab. From that point forth, it is a religious requirement imposed only by the elders.”
 - C. *And R. Isaac said, “On every day of the festival, it is merely a religious requirement imposed by elders, and that applies even to the first day.”*
 - D. *But lo, we have it as an established fact that the first day’s [observance of the rite] is based upon the authority of the Torah.*
 - E. *Then I should formulate the statement, “Exclusive of the first day.”*
 - F. *If so, then, that [E] is just what R. Joshua b. Levi has said [B].*
 - G. *Then I should formulate the matter, “And so has R. Isaac said.”*
 - H. *And Rab also takes the view that the religious duty of carrying the lulab applies for all seven days of the Festival. [This is now demonstrated by inference, a demonstration bearing its own talmud.]*
 - I. For R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab said, “He who lights the Hanukkah light has to say a blessing.” [Since the lighting of the Hanukkah lamp is only on the authority of rabbis, it must follow that Rab will concur likewise in the case of the lulab, carried on the last six of the seven days solely on the authority of the rabbis, also requires a blessing, and the rest follows].
 - J. R. Jeremiah said, “He who says the Hanukkah light has to say a blessing.”
 - K. *What blessings does he say?*
 - L. Said R. Judah, “On the first day, the one who lights the flame says three blessings and the one who sees it says two. From that night onward, the one who lights the light says two blessings, and the one who sees it says only one blessing.”
 - M. *What blessing does one say?*
 - N. “Blessed ... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to light the Hanukkah light.”
 - O. And where did he so command us?
 - P. [The commandment concerning Hanukkah, a rabbinically ordained rite, derives from the verse,] “You shall not turn aside” (Deu. 17:11). [Even what rabbis require enjoys the authority of the Torah.]
 - Q. And R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “‘Ask your father and he will tell you’ (Deu. 32: 7). [The point is the same.]
 - R. *R. Nahman bar Isaac repeated this matter explicitly, “Rab said, ‘All seven days it is a religious duty to carry the lulab.’”*

IV.4. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **He who makes a sukkah for himself says, “Praised who has kept us in life ...” One who enters to dwell in it says, “Praised ... who has sanctified us ...” [T. Ber. 6:9].**
- C. If the sukkah was ready-made and available, if the householder can do something new to it, he still says a blessing. But if not, when he goes in to dwell there, he says two blessings.
- D. *Said R. Ashi, “I saw that R. Kahana said all of the blessings [for the sukkah] over the cup of wine used for the sanctification.”*
- E. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: He who has to carry out many religious duties says, “Blessed ... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning the religious duties [in general].”*
- F. **R. Judah says, “He says an individual blessing for each one” [cf. T. Ber. 6:9].**
- G. *Said R. Zira, and some say it in the name of R. Hanina bar Papa, “The decided law accords with the view of R. Judah.”*
- H. *And R. Zira, and some say it in the name of R. Hanina bar Para, “What is the scriptural basis for the view of R. Judah?”*
- I. *“It is because it is written, ‘Blessed be the Lord day by day’ (Psa. 68:20).*
- J. *“Now do people say a blessing for him by day, but by night they do not as say a blessing for him? [Surely not.]*
- K. *“But the verse comes to tell you that, day by day, one must give back to him appropriate blessings.*
- L. *“Here too, for each and every matter one should give back to him a blessing that is appropriate to that deed.”*
- M. *And R. Zira said, and some say it was R. Hanina bar Papa, “Come and see that the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, is not like the trait of mortal man.*
- N. *“In the case of mortal man, an empty vessel [46B] holds something, but a full vessel does not.*
- O. *“But the trait of the Holy One, blessed be he, [is not like that.] A full utensil will hold [something], but an empty one will not hold something.*
- P. *“For it is said, ‘And it shall come to pass, if you will listen diligently’ (Deu. 28: 1). [One has to learn much and if he does, he will retain his knowledge.]*
- Q. *“The sense is, If you will listen, you will go on listening, and if not, you will not go on listening.*
- R. *“Another matter: If you hear concerning what is already in hand, you will also hear what is new.*
- S. *““But if your heart turns away’ (Deu. 30:17), you will not hear anything again.”*

V.1 A. They take their lulabs from the children’s hands [M. 4:7A]:

- B. *Said R. Yohanan, “A citron [that has been used for its religious purpose] may not [be eaten] on the seventh day [of the festival], but on the eighth, it may [be eaten].*
- C. *“But as to the sukkah, even on the eighth day it may not [be used for fuel]. [People may not burn up the wood that has been used in the sukkah, even after the*

seven days of use of the sukkah are over. They must wait until after the Eighth Day of Assembly.]”

- D. And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “as to the citron, even on the seventh day it also may [be eaten, once it is no longer needed for its religious purpose].”
- E. *What is at issue between the two authorities?*
- F. *One party holds that it was specifically for carrying out a religious duty that the citron was set aside. [Once that has been carried out, even on the seventh day, it may be eaten, thus Simeon b. Laqish.]*
- G. *And the other party takes the view that it was set aside for the entire day [on which it is required for the performance of a religious duty, and not only for the religious purpose for which it is needed. Hence it may not be eaten on the whole of the seventh day, even after it has served its religious purpose, thus Yohanan.]*
- H. R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan [by citing the Mishnah-passage at hand]: **“They take their lulabs from the children’s hands and eat their citrons [M. 4:7].**
- I. *“Now would it not then be the case that the same rule applies to adults [which would support the view that people may eat the citron even on the seventh day of the Festival]?”*
- J. *No, the rule applies only to children.*
- K. *There are those who state matters in this way:*
- L. R. Yohanan objected to R. Simeon b. Laqish: **“They take their lulabs from the children’s hands and eat their citrons [M. 4:7].**
- M. *“That rule then applies indeed to the children, but not to the adults [and that would support the view that people may not eat the citron on the seventh day of the Festival].”*
- N. *No, the rule applies both to children and to adults. The reason that the passage refers specifically to children is that this is how things generally are.*
- O. *Said R. Papa to Abbaye, “In the view of R. Yohanan, what is the difference between the sukkah and the citron [that he objects to using the wood in the sukkah for fuel even on the eighth day]?”*
- P. *He said to him, “[The sukkah may be needed until the very last moment of the seventh day and into the eighth. [For] the sukkah may well serve at twilight [at the end of the seventh day], since if the householder was eating a meal there, he would want to sit in the sukkah and eat there [right past sunset]. In this case the use of the sukkah was originally planned for twilight. Since the sukkah had been designated for use at twilight, it also was designated for use for the entirety of the eighth day.*
- Q. *“But the citron, which serves no purpose at twilight [at the end of the seventh day of the Festival] has not then been designated for use at twilight, and, in consequence, likewise has not been designated for use of the whole of the eighth day either.”*
- R. [Reverting to the issue raised at B], Levi said, “Even on the eighth day it is forbidden to eat the citron.”
- S. And the father of Samuel said, “On the seventh day it is forbidden to eat the citron, but on the eighth day it is permitted.”

- T. *But the father of Samuel adopted the thesis of Levi. R. Zira adopted the thesis of the Father of Samuel.*
- U. For R. Zira said, "It is forbidden to eat a citron that has been invalidated for all seven days of the Festival, [but one may do so on the eighth day]."
- V.2.** A. *Said R. Zira, "A person should not acquire possession for a child of a lulab on the first festival day of the Festival.*
- B. *"What is the reason? It is that a child has the power to acquire possession [of an object] but not the power to impart the right of possession to another party, with the result that the man would end up carrying out his obligation to make use of the lulab with a lulab that does not belong to him [which, we know, is not permitted]."*
- C. *And R. Zira said, "Someone should not say to a child 'I'm going to give you something,' and then not give it to him.*
- D. *"The reason is that the child will come to learn how to lie,*
- E. *"for it is said, 'They have taught their tongues to speak lies' (Jer. 9: 4)."*
- V.3.** A. [Reverting to the issue of V:1:] *Now in the dispute between R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish [we have the following parallel debate]:*
- B. *It has been stated on Amoraic authority:*
- C. If one has set aside seven citrons for use [in carrying out his religious obligation] on the seven successive days of the Festival:
- D. Said Rab, "With each one of them, in succession, he carries out his religious obligation, and then he eats that one forthwith."
- E. But R. Assi said, "With each one of them, in succession, he carries out his religious obligation, but then only on the following day does he eat the citron that he has used."
- F. *What is at issue here?*
- G. *One party holds that it was specifically for carrying out a religious duty with it that that citron was set aside. [Once that has been carried out, it may be eaten even on the same day, so Rab.]*
- H. *The other party takes the view that it was set aside for the entire day [on which it is required for the performance of a religious duty, and not only for the religious purpose for which it is needed. Hence it may not be eaten on the selfsame day, even after it has served its religious purpose, so Assi.]*
- V.4.** A. *Now how are we, who keep two days of the Festival, to do things?*
- B. Said Abbaye, "As to the eighth day which might be the ninth day of the festival, it is forbidden [to eat the citron]. As to the ninth day, which might be the eighth day, it is permitted [to eat the citron]."
- C. Maremar said, "Even on the eighth day which may be the seventh, it is permitted [to eat it]."
- D. *In Sura people act in accord with Maremar's position.*
- E. *R. Shisha, son of R. Idi, acted in accord with Abbaye's position.*
- F. *And the decided law accords with Abbaye's position.*

- V.5.** A. Said R. Judah, son of R. Samuel bar Shilat, in the name of Rab, “On the eighth day which may be the seventh, we treat it as the seventh day so far as use of the sukkah is concerned, and the eighth day so far as the requisite blessing is concerned. [One makes use of the sukkah, but does not say a blessing in that connection when one says the daily prayers, the grace after meals, and the sanctification over wine].”
- B. And R. Yohanan said, “It is deemed equivalent to the eighth day for all purposes.”
- C. *As to dwelling in the sukkah, all parties concur that people must dwell there on that day.*
- D. *Where there is a dispute [47A] it concerns saying blessings [in connection with doing so, that is, “Praised ... who has commanded us to dwell in the sukkah”].*
- E. *In the view of him who has said that day is regarded as the seventh day so far as the sukkah is concerned, people also must say the requisite blessing.*
- F. *As to him who says, “It is treated as the eighth day for all purposes,” people do not say the cited blessing.*
- G. *Said R. Joseph, “Stick with the view of R. Yohanan.*
- H. *“For R. Huna bar Bizna and all the great sages of the generation happened to come to a sukkah on the eighth day that may have been the seventh. They sat down in the sukkah but said no blessing. [That then accords with Yohanan’s view of matters.]”*
- I. *But perhaps they were in accord with the view of him who has said, “Once one says a blessing for sitting in the sukkah on the first festival day of the Festival, one does not have to say a blessing in that regard any more.”?*
- J. *There is a tradition in connection with this story that the sages had just then come in from the fields [and so had not yet sat in a sukkah during the entire festival, so that possibility cannot be invoked in explaining away the precedent at hand].*
- K. *There are those who report that all parties concur [as against D] that one does not say the blessing in connection with sitting in the sukkah. Where there is a dispute, it is whether or not to begin with one has to sit in the sukkah at all on that day.*
- L. *In the view of one who maintains that the day in doubt as is treated as the seventh day as regards the sukkah, one does have to sit in the sukkah.*
- M. *In the view of him who maintains that the day in doubt is treated as to the eighth day for all purposes, one does not have to sit in the sukkah on the day that is subject to doubt.*
- N. *Said R. Joseph, “Stick with the view of R. Yohanan.*
- O. *“For who is the authority behind the statement [in the name of Rab]? It is R. Judah, son of R. Samuel bar Shilat, and on the eighth day which might be the seventh, he sat outside of a sukkah [contrary to the law as he cited it. So he himself did not believe the rule as he reported it.]”*
- P. *The decided law is that people do sit in the sukkah on that day but do not say the requisite blessing in that connection.*

V.6. A. Said R. Yohanan, “On the eighth day of the Festival “the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly] people say the blessing of ‘the season’ [who has kept us in life and

sustained us and brought us to this season”] but they do not say that blessing on the seventh day of Passover.”

- B. And R. Levi bar Hama, and some say, R. Hama bar Hanina, said, “You may know that that is the case [that the eighth day of the Festival is treated as a distinct festival, so requiring the distinct blessing of ‘season,’ as specified just now].
- C. “For lo, it is distinct [from the preceding days of the Festival] in three aspects: in use of the sukkah, in waving the lulab, and in making the water-offering.”
- D. *In the view of R. Judah, who has held that one would make the water offering with a log of water on all eight days, the eighth day of the Festival is distinct from the preceding seven days in two aspects [and not three].”*
- E. *If that is the principal consideration, then as to the seventh day of Passover, lo, it too is distinct from the preceding days, in regard, in particular, to the matter of the religious requirement of eating unleavened bread.*
- F. For a master has said, “On the first night of Passover it is a religious duty [to eat unleavened bread] and from that point onward it is an optional, but not an obligatory, matter.”
- G. *How now! In that case [Passover] it is distinct from the first night only, but it is hardly distinct from the remaining days. But in the present case [of the eighth day of the Festival] the holy day is distinct even from the other days.*
- H. Said Rabina, “This one [namely, the eighth day of the Festival is distinct from the preceding day [and all the others], while that one [the seventh day of Passover] is distinct from the days preceding the day before.
- I. [Slotki, p. 220, n. 6: The next three statements point out that in the section dealing with the sacrifices of the Festival, Num. 29:12-39, there are differences between the first seven days of the Festival of Sukkot 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 [Num. 29:36]; (b) the descriptions of the sacrifices of the second to the seventh day begin with the word, and, suggesting continuity, while that of the Eighth Day commences, ‘On the eighth day,’ omitting the and; (c) on the seventh day it says, “According to their ordinance, “connecting it with the previous days, whereas the Eighth Day, has, “according to the ordinance.”] R. Pappa said, “Here it is written, ‘bullock,’ while there, ‘bullocks’ [cf. Num. 29:36].”
- J. R. Nahman bar Isaac said, “Here [on the eighth day] it is written only, ‘On the day,’ while there it is written, ‘And on the day.’”
- K. R. Ashi said, “Here [concerning the eighth day] it is written, ‘In accord with the ordinance,’ while there [in the case of the seventh day] it is written, ‘according to their ordinance.’”
- L. *May we say that the following passage supports the view of R. Yohanan [at A, that the blessing, “who has brought us to this season” is said on the Eighth Day of the Festival]:*
- M. The bullocks, rams, and lambs [offered on the Festival] impair one another [so that if one is not offered properly, the entire group of animals is invalidated and a new group must be offered up properly].

- N. And R. Judah says, "They do not impair one another, for lo, they grow fewer in number as the days pass." [Slotki, p. 221, n. 1: As the number is in any case steadily diminished, the additional omission of one or more cannot affect the remainder.]
- O. They said to him, "But is it not the case that all of them [including rams and lambs] are reduced in number on the eighth day [which thus should be regarded as a separate entity]?"
- P. He said to them, "The Eighth Day [of Solemn Assembly] is an entity unto itself. For just as the seven days of the Festival require an offering, song, blessing, and lodging overnight in Jerusalem." [This passage is subjected to its own exegetical talmud below, beginning at Y. First we complete our utilization of the passage for the purposes for which it is introduced, then we read it in its own terms for the sake of a complete exposition of all materials that are introduced.]
- Q. **[47B]** *Now does not the reference to "a blessing" in the foregoing passage not allude to that covering the season [as Yohanan has claimed. This then explicitly supports that view.]*
- R. *No, it speaks of a separate reference, to the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, in the Grace after Meals and in the Prayer.*
- S. *That conclusion, moreover, is reasonable, for if you think that reference here is made to the blessing for the season, is the blessing for the season stated at all on all seven days of the Festival? [No, it is not. So the sense of the allusion to "a blessing" cannot bear that meaning at all. It can only be what R. has said.]*
- T. *No, there is no difficulty after all. For if someone did not say a blessing for the season on one day, he says it on the next day or on the day after that [with the result that the reference to "blessing" may well be to the blessing for the season, against A and Q.]*
- U. *In any event, we require that the blessing over the season be recited over a cup of wine, [and people do not have a cup of wine on the intermediate days of the festival, so the problem indeed recurs].*
- V. *[If then we assume that "blessing" in the cited passage refers to the blessing of the season, would this not] support the view of R. Nahman, for R. Nahman said, "As to the blessing of the season, one says it even in the market place [and not necessarily over a cup of wine]"?*
- W. *Now if you maintain that we require a cup of wine in that connection, is there a requirement for a blessing over a cup of wine every day [of the Festival]? [Surely not!]*
- X. *Perhaps we deal with a case in which a cup of wine came to hand only later on.*
- Y. [Reverting to the clarification of the cited passage, P, we ask:] Does R. Judah then take the view that the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly imposes the requirement of lodging overnight of Jerusalem?
- Z. *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- AA. R. Judah says, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that as to the second Passover [in Iyyar, not Nisan], it is not necessary to stay overnight in Jerusalem? As it is said, 'And you shall turn in the morning and go into your tents'

(Deu. 16: 7) and, forthwith thereafter, it is written, 'Six days you shall eat unleavened bread' (Deu. 16: 8).

- BB. "What follows from the juxtaposition of these two verses is simple. In the case of the Passover that requires a six day observance of unleavened bread there also is the requirement of lodging overnight, and in the case of the Passover that does not require a six day observance of the rite of unleavened bread also does not require lodging overnight in Jerusalem."
- CC. *What then is excluded? Is it not to exclude, in addition, the Eighth Day of the Festival?*
- DD. *No, it serves only to eliminate the second Passover, which is similar to [the First Passover. Other festivals are not under discussion.]*
- EE. *That indeed is a reasonable conclusion, for we have learned in the following passage of the Mishnah:*
- FF. **The offering of the first fruits requires a sacrifice, song, waving of the produce, and lodging overnight in Jerusalem [M. Bik. 2:4].**
- GG. *Who then takes the view that the offering of the the first fruits requires an act of waving? It is R. Judah.*
- HH. *And he also takes the view that lodging overnight in Jerusalem is required.*
- II. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- JJ. R. Judah says, "'And you shall set [the basket of first fruits] down' (Deu. 26:10).
- KK. "This refers to waving the basket.
- LL. "You say it refers to waving the basket, but perhaps the sense is that it is literally set down.
- MM. "Since further on, it says, 'And set it down' (Deu. 26: 4), that takes care of that action.
- NN. "To what, then, does the cited verse, 'And you shall set ... down ...' refer? It can only refer to waving."
- OO. *But perhaps the cited passage of the Mishnah accords with the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob [Slotki, p. 223, n. 4: and not with R. Judah, who may maintain that whatever rite lasts for less than six days requires neither the one nor the other.]*
- PP. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- QQ. "'And the priest shall take the basket out of your hand' (Deu. 26: 4) teaches that the basket of first fruits has to be waved," the words of R. Eliezer b. Jacob.
- RR. *What is the reason for the view of R. Eliezer b. Jacob?*
- SS. *There is an analogy drawn between the use of the word "hand" here and the use of the same word in connection with peace-offerings.*
- TT. Here it is written, "And the priest shall take the basket out of your hand" (Deu. 6 26: 4), and there [with reference to the peace-offering] it is written, "His own hands shall bring the offering to the Lord (Lev. 7:30).
- UU. Just as in the present case it is the priest who does the work, so there it is the priest who does it.
- VV. Just as in that other passage, it is the owner who participates, so here too the owner participates.

WW. How is this possible [for both to be involved]? The priest puts his hand underneath the hand of the owner and waves [the basket of first fruits, just as he would do in the case of the animal brought as a sacrifice in the category of peace-offerings].

XX. *What, at any rate, is the upshot of the issue?*

YY. R. Nahman said, "People say the blessing for the season on the Eighth Day of the Festival."

AAA. *The decided law is that people do say the blessing for the season on the Eighth Day of the Festival.*

BBB. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of R. Nahman:*

CCC. The Eighth Day [48A] of Solemn Assembly constitutes a festival unto itself for the matters of balloting to see which priest does what job, for the saying of the blessing for the season, for the character of the holiday as distinct from the Festival of Sukkot [so the sukkah is not used], the sacrifice, the psalm, and the benediction. [In all these aspects it is a completely distinct holy day and not a continuation of the Festival of Sukkot].

The most interesting aspect of the construction before us does not pertain to the Mishnah-paragraph, but to the relationship between the seven days of the Festival of Sukkot and the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly, with which the Festival concludes. Is this part of the Festival or a distinct holy day on its own? My own inclination is to suppose that the protracted discussion would better serve M. 4:8A-B, which follows. But it clearly is meant to continue the units that come before it. These, after all, persistently refer to the eighth day, specifically to the doubts concerning the designation, in the Exilic communities, of the eighth day. So, overall, the construction appears to follow a rather subtle program. Units I:1 and II:1 gloss the cited clauses of the Mishnah. I take it unit II:2 is inserted because it is joined through Abbahu's name to the foregoing, and unit II:3 because of Jeremiah-Simeon b. Yohai. Unit III:1 then reverts to M., as indicated, along with unit IV:1. Unit IV:2 opens a secondary issue, the blessings said over the lulab and the sukkah and the comparison between the two distinct rites. This leads directly to the issue of how we treat religious rites repeated from day to day. Are they of the same status, or is the important act only the first one. Unit V:1 then directs attention to M. 4:7A. But the issue of the relationship between two of the rites of the Festival, on the one side, and successive days of the festival — particularly the seventh, then the eighth (the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly) is raised. That issue thus extends the basic premise.

4:8A-B

A. The Hallel-Psalms and the rejoicing are for eight days: How so?

B. This rule teaches that a person is obligated for the Hallel-Psalms, for the rejoicing, and for the honoring of the festival day, on the last festival day of the Festival, just as he is on all the other days of the Festival.

I.1 A. [The Hallel-Psalms and the rejoicing are for eight days:] How on the basis of Scripture do we know this rule?

- B. *It accords with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “And you shall be altogether joyful” (Deu. 16:15) serves to encompass the last nights of the festival.
- D. Perhaps it refers only to the first Festival day.
- E. When Scripture says, “Altogether,” the word serves to distinguish [one set of Festival days from the other].
- F. Why then encompass the last nights of the Festival and exclude the first ones?
- G. I encompass the last nights of the Festival, [on the days] before which there is an aspect of rejoicing, and exclude the first nights of the festival, [on the days] before which there is no aspect of rejoicing.

The Talmud provides a scriptural basis for the Mishnah’s rules. The larger issues of the required conduct on the Eighth Day of Solemn Assembly have already been worked out in the preceding.

4:8C-F

- C. **The obligation to dwell in the sukkah for seven days: How so?**
- D. **[If] one has finished eating [the last meal of the festival], he should not untie his sukkah right away.**
- E. **But he brings down the utensils [only] from twilight onward —**
- F. **on account of the honor due to the last festival day of the Festival. — M. 4:8**
- I.1 **[But he brings down the utensils [only] from twilight onward:]** [In line with M. 4:8E], if someone has no utensils to bring down, what is the law?
 - B. If he had no utensils?! Then what did he use [in the sukkah]?
 - C. *Rather, the question is to be phrased as follows:*
 - D. If the householder had no place to which to bring down his utensils, what is the law? [What if he had nowhere else to eat?]
 - E. R. Hiyya bar Ashi said, “He removes four handbreadths [of the roof of the sukkah itself, thus removing the sukkah from valid use].”
 - F. R. Joshua b. Levi said, “He lights a lamp in it [which is not to be done in a valid sukkah. That indicates that the sukkah is no longer in use in connection with the Festival.]”
 - G. *And there is no difference between the two authorities, one referring to how we do things [here in Babylonia], and the other to how they do things there [in the Land of Israel]. [In Babylonia, the eighth day may be the seventh, so one cannot remove the sukkah-roofing, and kindling the lamp is the only reasonable procedure.]*
 - H. *[Lighting a lamp] is suitable in the case of a small sukkah [where one may not bring a lamp], what is there to say?*
 - I. *One may bring into the sukkah dishes for eating.*
 - J. *For Raba said, “Dishes for eating are to be kept outside of the sukkah, dishes for drinking are to be kept in the sukkah.” [Thus bringing the dishes into the sukkah indicates that the sukkah now is no longer preserved for sacred purposes.]*

The Talmud clarifies a minor aspect of the rule, M. 4:8E.

4:9-10

- A. The water-libation: How so?
- B. A golden flask, holding three logs in volume, did one fill with water from Siloam.
- C. [When] they reached the Water Gate, they blow a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained blast on the shofar.
- D. [The priest] went up on the ramp [at the south] and turned to his left [southwest].
- E. There were two silver bowls there.
- F. R. Judah says, “They were of plaster, but they had darkened because of the wine.”
- G. They were perforated [48B] with holes like a narrow snout,
- H. one wide, one narrow,
- I. so that both of them would be emptied together [one of its wine, flowing slowly, the other of its water, flowing quickly].
- J. The one on the west was for water, the one on the east was for wine.
- K. [If] he emptied the flask of water into the bowl for wine, and the flask of wine into the bowl for water, he has nonetheless carried out the rite.
- L. R. Judah says “A log [of water] would one pour out as the water libation all eight days.”
- M. And to the one who pours out the water libation they say, “Lift up your hand [so that we can see the water pouring out]!”
- N. For one time one [priest] poured out the water on his feet.
- O. And all the people stoned him with their citrons.

M. 4:9

- A. As the rite concerning it [was carried out] on an ordinary day, so was the rite [carried out] on the Sabbath.
- B. But on the eve of Sabbath one would fill with water from Siloam a gold jug, which was not sanctified,
- C. and he would leave it in a chamber [in the Temple].
- D. [If] it was poured out or left uncovered, one would fill the jug from the laver [in the courtyard].
- E. For wine and water which have been left uncovered are invalid for the altar.

M. 4:10

- I.1** A. [[When] they reached the Water Gate, they blow a sustained, a quavering, and a sustained blast on the shofar:] *What is the scriptural source for the rule [at M. 4:9C about sounding the ram’s horn]?*
- B. Said R. Ina, “It is that Scripture has said, ‘Therefore with joy you shall draw water from the wells of salvation’ (Isa. 12: 3).

Therefore with joy you shall draw water from the wells of salvation

- I.2.** A. *There were two heretics, one called Joy, the other, Gladness.*

- B. *Said Joy to Gladness, "I am better than you, for it is said, 'They shall obtain Joy and Gladness' (Isa. 35:10)."*
- C. *Said Gladness to Joy, "I am better than you, for it is written, 'Gladness and Joy go to the Jews' (Est. 8:17)."*
- D. *Said Joy to Gladness, "Some day they will take you and make you a courier, since it is said, 'For with gladness they shall go forth' (Isa. 55:12)."*
- E. *Said Gladness to Joy, "One day they will take you and fill you with water, as it is written, 'Therefore with joy you shall draw water' (Isa. 12: 3)."*

I.3. A. *A heretic named Joy said to R. Abbahu, "You are destined to draw water for me in the world to come, for it is written, 'Therefore with joy you shall draw water' (Isa. 12: 3)."*

- B. *He said to him, "If it were written, 'For joy,' matters would have you been as you maintain. But since it is written, 'With joy,' the sense is that with the skin of that man [you] people will make a water-bucket and will draw water with it."*

II.1 A. **The priest went up on the ramp at the south and turned to his left, southwestward [M. 4:9D]:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **All who go up to the altar go up on the right, that is, to the east, and walk around the altar and go down on the left, that is, of the west**
- D. **except for those who go up for these three purposes, who go up on the left and turn around [going up at the west and going down at the west]:**
- E. **those who go up for the water-offering, for the wine-offering, and for the burnt offering of fowl when the east side of the altar is too busy [T. Zeb. 7:7].**

III.1 A. **...but they had darkened... [M. 4:9F]:**

- B. *Now there is no problem regarding the one for wine, which will darken, but why should the one for water darken?*
- C. *Since the authority at hand has said, **If he emptied the flask of water into the bowl for wine, and the flask of wine into the bowl for water [M. 4:9K],***
- D. *it turns out that the one for water may darkened as well.*

IV.1 A. **They were perforated with holes like a narrow snout [M. 4:9G]:**

- B. *May we conclude that the Mishnah's statement accords with the view of R. Judah and not that of rabbis?*
- C. *For we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- D. **R. Judah says, "A log of water would one pour out as the water libation all eight days" [M. 4:9L].**
- E. *But it cannot accord with rabbis, for, from their viewpoint, why should the water and wine not pour out together? [In Judah's view the wine was, in volume, three logs, so a larger hole would be needed for the wine flask than for the water. So far as rabbis are concerned, each was three logs in volume.]*
- F. *No, that is not a valid surmise. You may maintain that the passage accords even with the view of rabbis. Wine is thick, water is thin.*
- G. *That view is a reasonable one, for so far as R. Judah is concerned, the language he should prefer would be "broad" and "narrow."*

- H. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- I. R. Judah says, “Two bowls were there, one for water, one for wine. The mouth of the one for wine was broad, the mouth of the one for water was narrow, so that both of them would be emptied together [cf. M. 4:9G-I]. [The Tannaite teaching thus assigns M. 4:9G-I to the authority of Judah].
- J. *That is conclusive proof [for the proposition of F-G].*

V.1 A. The one on the west was for water [M. 4:9J]:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **For there was the case of the Boethusian who poured out the water on his feet, and all the people stoned him with their citrons [M. 4:9N-O].**
- D. **And the horn of the altar was damaged that day [so the sacred service was annulled for that day], until they brought a lump of salt and put it on it, not because the altar was once more validated, but so that the altar should not appear to be damaged.**
- E. **[49A] For any altar lacking a horn, ramp, or foundation is invalid.**
- F. **R. Yosé b. R. Judah says, “Also the rim” [T. Suk. 3:16D-F].**

- V.2. A.** Said Rabbah bar bar Hanan said R. Yohanan, “The pits [under the altar, to which the wine of the libation offering flowed] had been created in the six days of creation,
- B. “for it is said, ‘The roundings of your thighs are like the links of a chain, the work of the hands of a skilled workman’ (Son. 7: 2).
 - C. “‘The roundings of your thighs’ — these are the pits.
 - D. “‘Like the links of a chain’ indicates that their cavity goes down to the abyss.
 - E. “‘The work of the hands of a skilled workman’ — this refers to the skillful handiwork of the Holy One, blessed be he.”

V.3. A. A Tannaite authority of the house of R. Ishmael:

- B. “‘In the beginning’ (Gen. 1: 1) is not to be read ‘in the beginning,’ but rather, ‘he created the pit [of the altar].’”

V.4. A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. **R. Yosé says, “The cavity of the pits descended to the abyss, as 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. And he dug 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 (Isa. 5:1-2).**
- C. **“And he built a tower in the midst of it — this is the sanctuary.**
- D. **“And [also] hewed out a vat therein — this is the altar.**
- E. **“And also hewed out a vat therein — this is the pits.”**
- F. **R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq says, “There was a small passage-way between the ascent and the altar at the west side of the ramp.**
- G. **“Once every seventy years the young priests would go down there and gather up the congealed wine, which looked like circles of pressed figs, and they burned it in a state of sanctity, as it is said, In the holy place shall you pour out a drink-offering of strong drink unto the Lord (Num. 28: 7).**

- H. **[49B]** “Just as the pouring out must be in a state of sanctity, thus the burning of it must be in a state of sanctity” [T. Suk. 3:15C-I].
- I. *What evidence is there [for the statement of H]?*
- J. *Said Rabina, “There is an analogy to be drawn between two uses of the word ‘Holy.’*
- K. *“Here it is written, ‘In the Holy Place shall you pour out a drink-offering of strong drink to the Lord’ (Num. 28: 7), and it is written elsewhere, ‘Then you shall burn the remainder with fire, it shall not be eaten, because it is holy’ (Exo. 29:34).”*
- V.5.** A. *In accord with whose view does the following accord, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. *As to drink-offerings, at the outset the laws of sacrilege apply to them. Once they have poured down into the pits, the law of sacrilege do not apply to them.*
- C. *May I maintain that it must be R. Eleazar bar Sadoq* [Slotki, p. 231, n. 8: *who holds that the pits reached only to the floor of the court and that the wine poured into them was retrievable*]?
- D. *For it cannot be rabbis, who take the view that the pits descended to the abyss.* [Slotki, p. 231, n. 9: *No law, surely, is required for an object that is for ever lost in the abyss.*]
- E. *You may take the view that it accords even with rabbis’ position. We deal with the place where the wine was collected.*
- F. *There are those who repeat the matter in the following version:*
- G. *May we say that it accords with rabbis and not R. Eleazar bar Sadoq?*
- H. *For if the rule accorded with R. Eleazar, do the remnants not remain in their condition of sanctification?*
- I. *You may maintain that the rule accords even with R. Eleazar.*
- J. *You have nothing which has already served for the fulfillment of the religious duty concerning it and yet which remains subject to the laws of sacrilege.*
- V.6.** A. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “When the priests pour wine out on the altar, they stop up the pits.*
- B. *“This serves to carry out that which is said: ‘In holiness you shall pour out a drink-offering of strong drink to the Lord’ (Num. 28: 7).”*
- C. *What is the sense of the passage?*
- D. *Said R. Papa, ““Strong drink’ refers to drinking, satisfaction, and plenty.”*
- E. *Said R. Papa, “That then bears the implication that when a man has had enough wine, it is because his throat has had its fill.”*
- F. *Said Raba, “A young disciple of rabbis, who does not have much wine, should drink it in large mouthfuls.”* [Slotki: *since thereby he has the same satisfaction as if he drank much wine*].
- G. *Raba would swallow the wine of the cup of benediction in a big gulp.*

Interpreting Song of Songs 7:2:

“How beautiful are your steps in sandals, O prince’s daughter”

The reference at V.2 to Song 7:2 explains why these further treatments of the same verse are included, a topical appendix.

- V.7.** A. *Raba interpreted [Scripture as follows], “What is the sense of what is written, ‘How beautiful are your steps in sandals, O prince’s daughter’ (Son. 7: 2)?*
B. “How beautiful are the steps of Israel when they come up for a festal pilgrimage.
C. “‘Prince’s daughter’ — daughter of Abraham, our father, who was called a prince, as it is said, ‘The princes of the peoples are gathered together, the people of the God of Abraham’ (Psa. 47:10).
D. “‘The God of Abraham’ and not the God of Isaac and Jacob?
E. “The sense is, ‘The God of Abraham, who was first of the converts [to God].’”
- V.8.** A. *A Tannaite authority of the house of R. Anan taught, “What is the sense of Scripture’s statement, ‘The roundings of your thighs’ (Son. 7: 2)?*
B. “Why are the teachings of Torah compared to the thigh?
C. “It is to teach you that, just as the thigh is kept hidden, so teachings of Torah are to be kept hidden.”
D. *That is in line with what R. Eleazar said, “What is the sense of the verse of Scripture, ‘It has been told you, O man, what is good, and what the Lord requires of you: only to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God’ (Mic. 6: 8)?*
E. “‘To do justly’ refers to justice.
F. “‘To love mercy’ refers to doing deeds of loving kindness.
G. “‘And to walk humbly with your God’ refers to taking out a corpse for burial and bringing the bride in to the marriage-canopy.
H. “And is it not a matter of argument a fortiori:
I. “Now if, as to matters which are ordinarily done in public, the Torah has said, ‘To walk humbly,’ matters which are normally done in private, all the more so [must they be done humbly and in secret, that is, the giving of charity is done secretly].”
J. Said R. Eleazar, “Greater is the one who carries out an act of charity more than one who offers all the sacrifices.
K. “For it is said, ‘To do charity and justice is more desired by the Lord than sacrifice’ (Pro. 21: 3).”
L. And R. Eleazar said, “An act of loving kindness is greater than an act of charity.
M. “For it is said, ‘Sow to yourselves according to your charity, but reap according to your loving kindness’ (Hos. 10:12).
N. “If a man sows seed, it is a matter of doubt whether he will eat a crop or not. But if a man harvests the crop, he most certainly will eat it.”
O. And R. Eleazar said, “An act of charity is rewarded only in accord with the loving kindness that is connected with it.
P. “For it is said, ‘Sow to yourselves according to your charity, but reap according to your loving kindness’ (Hos. 10:12).”

9. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. In three aspects are acts of loving kindness greater than an act of charity.
- C. An act of charity is done only with money, but an act of loving kindness someone carries out either with his own person or with his money.
- D. An act of charity is done only for the poor, while an act of loving kindness may be done either for the poor or for the rich.
- E. An act of charity is done only for the living. An act of loving kindness may be done either for the living or for the dead.

10. A. And R. Eleazar has said, “Whoever does an act of charity and justice is as if he has filled the entire world with mercy.

- B. “For it is said, ‘He loves charity and justice, the earth is full of the loving kindness of the Lord’ (Psa. 33: 5).
- C. “Now you might wish to say that whoever comes to jump may take a leap [Slotki: whoever wishes to do good succeeds without difficulty].
- D. “Scripture accordingly states, ‘How precious is your loving kindness, O God’ (Psa. 36: 8). [Slotki, p. 233, n. 11: The opportunity of doing real, well deserved charity and dispensing it in a judicious manner is rare].
- E. “Now you might wish to say that the same is the case for fear of Heaven [so that one who fears Heaven nonetheless has trouble in carrying out charity and justice].
- F. “Scripture accordingly states, ‘But the loving kindness of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him’ (Psa. 103:17).”
- G. Said R. Hama bar Papa, “Every man who enjoys grace is assuredly a God-fearer.
- H. “For it is said, ‘But the loving kindness of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him’ (Psa. 103:17).”
- I. And R. Eleazar said, “What is the sense of the following verse of Scripture: ‘She opens her mouth with wisdom, and the Torah of loving kindness is on her tongue’ (Pro. 31:26)?
- J. “Now is there such a thing as a Torah that is one of loving kindness and a Torah that is not one of loving kindness?
- K. “But rather the study of Torah done for its own sake falls into the category of Torah of loving kindness, and Torah not studied for its own sake falls into the category of Torah that is not of loving kindness.”
- L. There are those who say, “Study of Torah in order to teach it is Torah of loving kindness, while Torah learned not so as to teach it is Torah that is not of loving kindness.”

VI.1 A. **As the rite concerning it was carried out on an ordinary day, so was the rite carried out on the Sabbath [M. 4:10A]:**

- B. *But why [bring the water in a jug that was not sanctified] [M. 4:10B]?*
- C. *Said Zeiri, “The framer of the passage takes the view that there is no minimum volume for the water offering, while utensils of the Temple service serve to sanctify their contents even without the prior intent [of the one who uses them].*

- D. **[50A]** *“Now if the priest should bring the water in a jug that had been sanctified, the water [being sanctified] will be made unfit through being left to stand over night. [There is nothing the priest can do to prevent the sanctification of the water, and what has been sanctified is subject to the prohibition against being left overnight. So the only solution is not to bring the water in a sanctified utensil to begin with.]”*
- E. Said Hezekiah, “Utensils of service sanctify their contents only with prior intent [of the one who uses them. [So the issue raised by Zeiri is of no bearing.] But it is a precautionary decree, so that people will not think that the water was deliberately sanctified [and then left overnight].”
- F. *Said R. Yannai said R. Zira, “Even if you say that [1] there is a minimum volume of water that is required for the water-offering, and, further, [2] that utensils of service sanctify what is put in them only with the prior intention of the one who uses them, nonetheless the rule would be the same. [Why?]”*
- G. “It is a precautionary decree lest people say that the priest filled the utensil for the purpose of sanctifying [through washing] the hands and feet. [Slotki, p. 235, n. 2: Such water must first be hallowed, 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 might be drawn.]”

VII.1 A. If it was poured out or left uncovered [M. 4:10D]:

- B. *Why [was the water not used]? One should simply pour the water through a strainer.*
- C. *May I then say that the Mishnah-passage does not accord with the view of R. Nehemiah?*
- D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. Water that has been passed through a strainer nonetheless is subject to the consideration that it has been left uncovered.
- F. Said R. Nehemiah, “When is this the case? It is when the receptacle on the bottom has been left uncovered. But if the receptacle on the bottom has been covered, then even though the one on top [from which the fluid will pour out to be strained] has been left uncovered, there is no consideration of danger on account of the utensil’s fluid being left uncovered.
- G. “The reason is that the venom of a snake is like a fungus that floats to the surface and stands there [Slotki: in the strainer].”
- H. *You may say that the Mishnah-rule at hand [which does not take account of the possibility of straining the water that has been left uncovered] follows even the view of R. Nehemiah.*
- I. R. Nehemiah would make such a rule when the liquid that has been left uncovered is for ordinary use, but for use for the Most High, would he make the same rule?
- J. *For does not R. Nehemiah maintain the view: “Present it now to your governor, will he be pleased with you? Or will he accept your person?” (Mal. 1: 8). [What is used for the divine service must be unblemished.]*

The outline in Chapter Six shows graphically that in this unit there are two principles of agglomeration: (1) exposition of the Mishnah, and (2) amplification of materials used in the exposition of the Mishnah.