

VI

THE STRUCTURE AND SYSTEM OF BABYLONIAN TALMUD SUKKAH

Whether or not the Talmud of Babylonia is carefully organized in large-scale, recurrent structures and guided by a program that we may call systematic forms the principal question addressed by an academic commentary. The preceding chapters therefore have pointed toward the presentation set forth here.

By “structure” I mean, a clearly-articulated pattern that governs the location of fully-spelled out statements. By “system,” I mean, a well-crafted and coherent set of ideas that explain the social order of the community addressed by the writers of a document, a social philosophy, a theory of the way of life, world view, and character of the social entity formed by a given social group. I see a collective, anonymous, and political document, such as the one before us, as a statement to, and about, the way in which people should organize their lives and govern their actions. At issue then in any document such as the remarkable one before us is simple: does this piece of writing present information or a program, facts to whom it may concern, or a philosophically and aesthetically cogent statement about how things should be?

The connection between structure and system is plain to see. From the way in which people consistently frame their thoughts, we move to the world that, in saying things one way rather than in some other, they wish to imagine the world in which they wish to live, to which they address these thoughts. For if the document exhibits structure and sets forth a system, then it is accessible to questions of rationality. We may ask about the statement that its framers or compilers wished to make by putting the document together as they did. But if we discern no structure and perceive no systematic inquiry or governing points of analysis, then all we find here is inert and miscellaneous information, facts but no propositions, arguments, viewpoints.

Now the Talmud commonly finds itself represented as lacking organization and exhibiting a certain episodic and notional character. That view moreover characterizes the reading and representation of the document by learned and experienced scholars, who have devoted their entire lives to Talmud study and exegesis. It must follow that upon the advocate of the contrary view — the one implicit in the representation of the document for academic analysis — rests the burden of proof. I set forth the allegation that the Talmud exhibits a structure and follows a system and therefore exhibits a commonly-intelligible rationality. The claim to write an academic commentary explicitly states that proposition. For the tractate before us, I have therefore to adduce evidence and argument.

I maintain that through the normal procedures of reasoned analysis we may discern in the tractate a well-crafted structure. I hold that the structure made manifest, we may further identify the purpose and perspective, the governing system of thought and argument, of those who collected and arranged the tractate’s composites and put them together in the

way in which we now have them. By “structure” I mean, how is a document organized? and by “system,” what do the compilers of the document propose to accomplish in producing this complete, organized piece of writing? The answers to both questions derive from a simple outline of the tractate as a whole, underscoring the types of compositions and composites of which it is comprised. Such an outline tells us what is principal and what subordinate, and how each unit — composition formed into composites, composites formed into a complete statement — holds together and also fits with other units, fore and aft. The purpose of the outline then is to identify the character of each component of the whole, and to specify its purpose or statement. The former information permits us to describe the document’s structure, the latter, its system.

While the idea of simply outlining a Talmud-tractate beginning to end may seem obvious, I have never made such an outline before, nor has anyone else.* Yet, as we shall now see, the character of the outline dictates all further analytical initiatives. Specifically, when we follow the layout of the whole, we readily see the principles of organization that govern. These same guidelines on organizing discourse point also to the character of what is organized: complete units of thought, with a beginning, middle, and end, often made up of smaller, equally complete units of thought. The former we know as composites, the latter as compositions.

*I have provided complete outlines for the Mishnah and for the Tosefta in relationship to the Mishnah, and, not always in outline form, for the Midrash-compilations of late antiquity as well.

Identifying and classifying the components of the tractate — the composites, the compositions of which they are made up — we see clearly how the document coheres: the plan and program worked out from beginning to end. When we define that plan and program, we identify the facts of a pattern that permit us to say in a specific and concrete way precisely what the compilers of the tractate intended to accomplish. The structure realizes the system, the program of analysis and thought that takes the form of the presentation we have before us. From what people do, meaning, the way in which they formulate their ideas and organized them into cogent statements, we discern what they proposed to do, meaning, the intellectual goals that they set for themselves.

These goals — the received document they wished to examine, the questions that they brought to that document — realized in the layout and construction of their writing, dictate the points of uniformity and persistence that throughout come to the surface. How people lay out their ideas guides us into what they wished to find out and set forth in their writing, and that constitutes the system that defined the work they set out to accomplish. We move from how people speak to the system that the mode of discourse means to express, in the theory that modes of speech or writing convey modes of thought and inquiry.

We move from the act of thought and its written result backward to the theory of thinking, which is, by definition, an act of social consequence. We therefore turn to the matter of intention that provokes reflection and produces a system of inquiry. That statement does not mean to imply I begin with the premise of order, which sustains the thesis of a prior system that defines the order. To the contrary, the possibility of forming a coherent outline out of the data we have examined defines the first test of whether or not the document exhibits a structure and realizes a system. So everything depends upon the possibility of outlining the writing, from which all else flows. If we can see the order and

demonstrate that the allegation of order rests on ample evidence, then we may proceed to describe the structure that gives expression to the order, and the system that the structure sustains.

The present work undertakes the exegesis of exegesis, for the Talmud of Babylonia, like its counterpart in the Land of Israel, is laid out as a commentary to the Mishnah. That obvious fact defined the character of my academic commentary, since we have already faced the reality that our Bavli-tractate is something other than a commentary, though it surely encompasses one. The problems that captured my attention derived from the deeper question of how people make connections and draw conclusions. To ask about how people make connections means that we identify a problem — otherwise we should not have to ask — and what precipitated the problem here has been how a composition or a composite fits into its context, when the context is defined by the tasks of Mishnah-commentary, and the composition or composite clearly does not comment on the Mishnah-passage that is subjected to comment.

The experience of analyzing the document with the question of cogency and coherence in mind therefore yields a simple recognition. Viewed whole, the tractate contains no gibberish but only completed units of thought, sentences formed into intelligible thought and self-contained in that we require no further information to understand those sentences, beginning to end. The tractate organizes these statements as commentary to the Mishnah. But large tracts of the writing do not comment on the Mishnah in the way in which other, still larger tracts do. Then how the former fit together with the latter frames the single most urgent question of structure and system that I can identify.

Since we have already examined enormous composites that find their cogency in an other than exegetical program, alongside composites that hold together by appeal to a common, prior, coherent statement — the Mishnah-sentences at hand — what justifies my insistence that an outline of the document, resting on the premise that we deal with a Mishnah-commentary, govern all further description? To begin with, the very possibility of outlining Babylonian Talmud tractate Sukkah derives from the simple fact that the framers have given to their document the form of a commentary to the Mishnah. It is in the structure of the Mishnah-tractate that they locate everything together that they wished to compile. We know that is the fact because the Mishnah-tractate defines the order of topics and the sequence of problems.

Relationships to the Mishnah are readily discerned; a paragraph stands at the head of a unit of thought; even without the full citation of the paragraph, we should find our way back to the Mishnah because at the head of numerous compositions, laid out in sequence one to the next, clauses of the Mishnah-paragraph are cited in so many words or alluded to in an unmistakable way. So without printing the entire Mishnah-paragraph at the head, we should know that the received code formed the fundamental structure because so many compositions cite and gloss sentences of the Mishnah-paragraph and are set forth in sequence dictated by the order of sentences of said Mishnah-paragraph. Internal evidence alone suffices, then, to demonstrate that the structure of the tractate rests upon the Mishnah-tractate cited and discussed here. Not only so, but the sentences of the Mishnah-paragraphs of our tractate are discussed in no other place in the entire Talmud of Babylonia in the sequence and systematic exegetical framework in which they are set forth here; elsewhere we may find bits or pieces, but only here, the entirety of the tractate.

That statement requires one qualification, and that further leads us to the analytical task of our outline. While the entire Mishnah-tractate of Sukkah is cited in the Talmud, the framers of the Talmud by no means find themselves required to say something about every word, every sentence, every paragraph. On the contrary, they discuss only what they choose to discuss, and glide without comment by large stretches of the tractate. A process of selectivity, which requires description and analysis, has told the compilers of the Talmud's composites and the authors of its compositions* what demands attention, and what does not. Our outline has therefore to signal not only what passage of the Mishnah-tractate is discussed, but also what is not discussed, and we require a general theory to explain the principles of selection ("making connections, drawing conclusions" meaning, to begin with, making selections). For that purpose, in the outline, I reproduce the entirety of a Mishnah-paragraph that stands at the head of a Talmudic composite, and I underscore those sentences that are addressed, so highlighting also those that are not.

*This statement requires refinement. I do not know that all available compositions have been reproduced, and that the work of authors of compositions of Mishnah-exegesis intended for a talmud is fully exposed in the document as we have it. That is not only something we cannot demonstrate — we do not have compositions that were not used, only the ones that were — but something that we must regard as unlikely on the face of matters. All we may say is positive: the character of the compositions that address Mishnah-exegesis tells us about the concerns of the writers of those compositions, but we cannot claim to outline all of their concerns, on the one side, or to explain why they chose not to work on other Mishnah-sentences besides the ones treated here. But as to the program of the compositors, that is another matter: from the choices that they made (out of a corpus we cannot begin to imagine or invent for ourselves) we may describe with great accuracy the kinds of materials they wished to include and the shape and structure they set forth out of those materials. We know what they did, and that permits us to investigate why they did what they did. What we cannot know is what they did not do, or why they chose not to do what they did not do. People familiar with the character of speculation and criticism in Talmudic studies will understand why I have to spell out these rather commonplace observations. I lay out an argument based on evidence, not on the silences of evidence, or on the absence of evidence — that alone.

It follows that the same evidence that justifies identifying the Mishnah-tractate as the structure (therefore also the foundation of the system) of the Talmud-tractate before us also presents puzzles for considerable reflection. The exegesis of Mishnah-exegesis is only one of these. Another concerns the purpose of introducing into the document enormous compositions and composites that clearly hold together around a shared topic or proposition, e.g., my appendix on one theme or another, my elaborate footnote providing information that is not required but merely useful, and the like. My earlier characterization of composites as appendices and footnotes signalled the fact that the framers of the document chose a not-entirely satisfactory way of setting out the materials they wished to include here, for large components of the tractate do not contribute to Mishnah-exegesis in any way at all. If these intrusions of other-than-exegetical compositions were proportionately modest, or of topical composites negligible in size, we might dismiss them as appendages, not structural components that bear much of the weight of the edifice as a whole. Indeed, the language that I chose for identifying and defining these composites — footnotes, appendices, and the like — bore the implication that what is not Mishnah-commentary also is extrinsic to the Talmud's structure and system.

But that language served only for the occasion. In fact, the outline before us will show that the compositions are large and ambitious, the composites formidable and defining.

Any description of the tractate's structure that dismisses as mere accretions or intrusions so large a proportion of the whole misleads. Any notion that "footnotes" and "appendices" impede exposition and disrupt thought, contribute extraneous information or form tacked-on appendages — any such notion begs the question: then why fill up so much space with such purposeless information? The right way is to ask whether the document's topical composites play a role in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the compilers of the Talmud. We have therefore to test two hypotheses:

[1] the topical composites ("appendices," "footnotes") do belong and serve the compilers' purpose, or

[2] the topical composites do not participate in the re-presentation of the Mishnah-tractate by the Talmud and do not belong because they add nothing and change nothing.

The two hypotheses may be tested against the evidence framed in response to a single question: is this topical composite necessary? The answer to that question lies in our asking, what happens to the reading of the Mishnah-tractate in light of the topical composites that would not happen were we to read the same tractate without them? The outline that follows systematically raises that question, with results specified in due course. It suffices here to state the simple result of our reading of the tractate, start to finish: the question of structure, therefore also that of system, rests upon the position we identify for that massive component of the tractate that comprises not Mishnah-commentary but free-standing compositions and composites of compositions formed for a purpose other than Mishnah-commentary.

The principal rubrics are given in small caps. The outline takes as its principal rubrics two large-scale organizing principles.

The first is the divisions of the Mishnah-tractate to which the Talmud-tractate serves as a commentary. That simple fact validates the claim that the tractate exhibits a fully-articulated structure. But the outline must also underscore that the Mishnah-tractate provides both more and less than the paramount outline of the Talmud-tractate. It is more because sentences in the Mishnah-tractate are not analyzed at all. These untreated Mishnah-sentences are given in bold face lower case caps, like the rest of the Mishnah, but then are specified by underlining and enclosure in square brackets.

Second, it is less because the structure of the tractate accommodates large composites that address topics not defined by the Mishnah-tractate. That brings us to the second of the two large-scale modes of holding together both sustained analytical exercises and also large sets of compositions formed into cogent composites. These are treated also as major units and are indicated by Roman numerals, alongside the Mishnah-paragraphs themselves; they are also signified in small caps. But the principal rubrics that do not focus on Mishnah-commentary but on free-standing topics or propositions or problems are not given in boldface type. Consequently, for the purposes of a coherent outline we have to identify as autonomous entries in our outline those important composites that treat themes or topics not contributed by the Mishnah-tractate.

I. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:1A-F

**A. A SUKKAH WHICH IS TALLER THAN TWENTY CUBITS IS INVALID. R. JUDAH
DECLARES IT VALID:**

1. I:1: Comparison of M. **Suk. 1:1** and M. **Er. 1:1**, with the question: What differentiates the case of the sukkah, in which instance the rule is formulated in the language of unfitness without remedy, from the case of the alley-way, in which instance the framer of the Mishnah has specified the remedy [for an improper arrangement]?

2. I:2: What is the scriptural source for the rule [that the sukkah may not be taller than twenty cubits]?

3. I:3: With reference to the proof-texts adduced in No. 2, we turn to the dispute at M. 1:1A-B: In accord with what authority is the following statement...

a. I:4: The specification of the cited authorities, 3.A, C, E, on the minimum requirements of the sukkah, now comes under discussion in its own terms.

4. I:5: The law is that a valid sukkah must be able to contain a person's head, the greater part of his body, and his table.

a. I:6: Who stands behind the following teaching, which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority: A building that is not at least four cubits by four cubits is not truly a "house" — secondary analysis of the implications of the results of the foregoing.

I. I:7: Secondary analysis of components of the foregoing free-standing teaching.

II. I:8: As above.

III. I:9: As above.

IV. I:10: As above.

5. I:11: If a sukkah was taller than twenty cubits and one attempted to diminish its height by placing on the ground blankets and pillows, that does not constitute a valid act of diminution, and that is so even though the owner declared the objects to be abandoned and null.

6. I:12: [If a sukkah] was higher than twenty cubits, but palm leaves were hanging down within the twenty cubits, if the shade that they cast is greater than the sunlight they let through, the sukkah is valid, and if not, it is invalid. Sequence of rules on the same general problem, bearing internal exegeses of several of the rules.

7. I:13: If a person drove four posts into the ground and spread sukkah-roofing on them. [If] it was higher than twenty cubits, but the owner built a ledge in it across the entire front of the middle [of the three] walls of the sukkah, and [the ledge] has sufficient space to constitute a valid sukkah, it is a valid sukkah. Note that this composite bears secondary and tertiary expansions, as marked in the visual commentary.\

8. I:14: If someone dug four [round] poles into the ground and put sukkah-roofing on them, R. Jacob says, "To determine whether we have valid walls,] we take a perspective such that, if one should cut the pole and plane it, what would result would be a beam with a handbreadth of space on one side and a handbreadth of space on the other. Then the poles are judged to form a rectangular corner piece

[and so to constitute a double wall with each surface regarded as a wall unto itself, and if not, they are not required in that way.”

B. AND ONE WHICH IS NOT TEN HANDBREADTHS HIGH:

1. II:1: How do we know from Scripture that a wall whose height is less than ten handbreadths cannot be regarded as a valid wall?

a. II:1: Amplification of a detail of the foregoing.

2. II:3: And how do you know that the contained space of the sukkah not counting the covering is to be ten handbreadths? Perhaps that measurement encompasses the covering. In that case, the sukkah from the roofing to the ground may be less than ten handbreadths, and only inclusive of the roofing from the top, must it be ten handbreadths in height. The rule derives from the eternal house.

C. ONE WHICH DOES NOT HAVE THREE WALLS:

1. III:1: Two [of the walls must be] in accord with the law applying to them, but the third may be even a handbreadth. And R. Simeon says, “Three must be in accord with the law applying to them, but the fourth may be even a handbreadth.” [Large-scale secondary exposition of what is at issue between sages and Simeon.]

2. III:2: As to the wall that may be only a handbreadth [of the three or of the four, as indicated just now], where does the builder set it?

a. III:3: Secondary analysis of the rule, “Two of the walls must be in accord with the law applying to them, but the third may be even a handbreadth.”

D. OR ONE, THE LIGHT OF WHICH IS GREATER THAN THE SHADE OF WHICH, IS INVALID:

1. IV:1: When the light of the sukkah is more than the shadow on account of [inadequate] sukkah-roofing, the sukkah is invalid, but not when the greater light is on account of the character of the walls, which may not be opaque and so may permit light to fall into the hut.

E. THE SUKKAH MUST SERVE AS A PERMANENT NOT ONLY TEMPORARY DWELLING.

1. IV:2: Rabbi, R. Josiah, R. Judah, R. Simeon, Rabban Gamaliel, the House of Shammai, R. Eliezer, and ‘others’ all take the view that the sukkah must serve as a permanent not only temporary dwelling.

F. A SUKKAH THAT IS SHAPED LIKE A FURNACE, IF IN ITS CIRCUMFERENCE IS ENOUGH SPACE SO THAT TWENTY-FOUR MEN CAN SIT AROUND IT, IS VALID, AND IF NOT, IT IS INVALID.

1. IV:3: Demonstration of the stated proposition; ¹ = 3.

a. IV:4: Subsidiary point to restate the proposition at E.

G. A SUKKAH BUILT FOR GENTILES, WOMEN, CATTLE, AND OR SAMARITANS FALLS INTO THE CATEGORY OF A SUKKAH ON ALL ACCOUNTS AND IS VALID, SO LONG AS IT HAS SUKKAH-ROOFING IN ACCORD WITH THE LAW APPLYING TO IT.

1. IV:5: Demonstration of the stated proposition.

II. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:1 G-N

A. A SUPERANNUATED SUKKAH — THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI DECLARE IT INVALID. AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL DECLARE IT VALID.

AND WHAT EXACTLY IS A SUPERANNUATED SUKKAH? ANY WHICH ONE MADE THIRTY DAYS [OF MORE] BEFORE THE FESTIVAL [OF SUKKOT]. BUT IF ONE MADE IT FOR THE SAKE OF THE FESTIVAL, EVEN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR, IT IS VALID.

1. I:1: What is the scriptural basis for the respective Houses' opinions?
2. I:2: Comparison of the position of the House of Hillel with that of Judah: How can the House of Hillel accept as valid a sukkah that is not constructed for the purpose of observing the festival, in line with the principle expressed in Rab's statement that various things made to carry out a religious duty must be prepared for that very purpose?

III. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:2

A. HE WHO MAKES HIS SUKKAH UNDER A TREE IS AS IF HE MADE IT IN [HIS] HOUSE.

1. I:1: That is true of a tree whose branches produce more shade than light. But if the light under the tree is greater than the shadow, in which case the sukkah's own sukkah-roofing produces the shadow in the sukkah, the sukkah is valid.

B. A SUKKAH ON TOP OF A SUKKAH — THE ONE ON TOP IS VALID. AND THE ONE ON THE BOTTOM IS INVALID:

1. II:1: Scriptural proof for this proposition.
2. II:2: There are cases in which both [the upper and the lower] sukkah will be valid, cases in which both of them will be invalid, cases in which the one on the bottom will be invalid and the one on the top valid, and cases in which the one on the bottom will be invalid and the one on the top valid.

C. AND THE ONE ON THE BOTTOM IS INVALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, "IF THERE ARE NO RESIDENTS IN THE TOP ONE, THE BOTTOM ONE IS VALID:"

1. III:1: And how much space would there be between one sukkah and the other so that the lower sukkah would be invalid as a sukkah beneath a sukkah?

IV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:3

A. [IF] ONE SPREAD A SHEET ON TOP OF [A SUKKAH] ON ACCOUNT OF THE HOT SUN, OR UNDERNEATH [THE COVER OF BOUGHS] ON ACCOUNT OF DROPPINGS:

1. I:1: The stated condition pertains only to doing so on account of droppings of the branches. But if it was to adorn the sukkah], it is valid.
 - a. I:2: Secondary development of the foregoing: things put up to decorate the sukkah do not diminish the height of the sukkah.
 - b. I:3: Decorations for a sukkah which are four handbreadths higher than the roof — such an arrangement is valid.

B. OR [IF] HE SPREAD [A SHEET] OVER A FOUR-POST BED [IN A SUKKAH] [FOR DWELLING OR SLEEPING AND SO FOR FULFILLING ONE'S OBLIGATION TO DWELL IN THE SUKKAH]. BUT HE SPREADS IT OVER THE FRAME OF A TWO-POSTER BED:

1. II:1: It is permitted to sleep in a canopied bed in a sukkah, even though the canopy forms a roof, so long as it is not ten handbreadths high.
2. II:2: He who sleeps naked in a canopied bed pokes his head out of the canopy and recites the Shema. If he pokes his head out, then his body is deemed to be covered by the canopy, and the man then may say the Shema and is not regarded as naked but as clothed.
3. II:3: It is permitted to sleep in a sukkah in a bed with a canopy, even though the canopy is in the form of a roof and even though it is higher than ten handbreadths thus constituting an arrangement of a sukkah within a sukkah.

V. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:4

A. [IF] ONE TRAINED A VINE, GOURD, OR IVY OVER IT AND THEN SPREAD SUKKAH-ROOFING ON [ONE OF THESE], IT IS INVALID.

BUT IF THE SUKKAH-ROOFING EXCEEDED THEM, OR IF HE CUT THEM [THE VINES] DOWN, IT IS VALID.

1. I:1: It is necessary to shake the vines loose after cutting them down, so that the sukkah-roofing is constructed by deliberate action and so that the materials at hand are actually validated by such action. Merely cutting the vines from the ground by itself does not constitute an act of deliberate validation.

a. I:2: Illustrative case.

B. THIS IS THE GENERAL RULE: WHATEVER IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS AND DOES NOT GROWN FROM THE GROUND — THEY DO NOT MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING WITH IT. AND WHATEVER IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, BUT DOES GROW FROM THE GROUND [AND HAS BEEN CUT OFF] — THEY DO MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING WITH IT.

1. II:1: What is the scriptural basis for this rule? The governing metaphor.
2. II:2: As above.
3. II:3: As above.

VI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:5

A. BUNDLES OF STRAW, WOOD, OR BRUSH — THEY DO NOT MAKE A SUKKAH-ROOFING WITH THEM. BUT ANY OF THEM WHICH ONE UNTIED IS VALID. AND ALL OF THEM ARE VALID [AS IS] FOR USE FOR THE SIDES [OF THE SUKKAH].

1. I:1: Explanation for this rule and for that at M. Suk. 1:8.
2. I:2: If one made sukkah-roofing with male arrow-shaft which are inserted into the arrow-head, it is valid [because the wood is regarded as unprepared, and a flat piece of wood not subjected to a process of manufacture is not susceptible to uncleanness.

3. I:3: If one made a sukkah-roofing of processed stalks of flax, it is invalid. If he made it of unprocessed stalks of flax, it is valid [T. Suk. 1:5]. The latter are not susceptible to uncleanness, the former are. But I do not know the status of stalks of flax in an intermediate stage of preparation.

4. I:4: As to licorice-wood and wormwood, they make sukkah-roofing with them.

5. I:5: People may make sukkah-roofing with the forked portion of a palm tree. Even though they form a bundle, since it is formed in nature, it is not regarded as a bundle. People may make a sukkah-roofing with forked reeds. Even though they form a bundle, since it is formed in nature, it is not regarded as a bundle.

6. I:6: Joining something to itself does not fall into the category of a bundle. Joining three distinct items together does put the whole into the category of a bundle.

7. I:7: As to [reeds tied into bundles which are on sale in] Sura, people may make sukkah-roofing with them, even though they are bound together.

8. I:8: As to those vegetables about which it is specified that by eating them a person may carry out his obligation to eat bitter herbs] on Passover, all have the capacity to bring uncleanness as a Tent, should they overshadow both something susceptible to uncleanness and a corpse; they do not interpose against uncleanness [as a vertical partition; they invalidate sukkah-roofing if they are used in a sukkah as does an open air space.

9. I:9: He who cuts grapes for the vat does not render the stalks of the grapes susceptible to uncleanness. He who cuts grain for sukkah-roofing does not render the stalks of the grain susceptible to uncleanness.

a. I:10: Gloss on the foregoing.

I. I:11: Homily on foregoing.

VII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:6

A. “THEY MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING WITH BOARDS,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. AND R. MEIR PROHIBITS DOING SO.

1. I:1: The dispute deals with boards of four handbreadths, for R. Meir affirms the precautionary decree [against using such boards, lest they form] a roof, while R. Judah does not affirm that precautionary decree. But as to boards that are not four handbreadths, all parties concur that use of such boards in sukkah-roofing is valid.

B. [IF] ONE PUT ON TOP OF IT A BOARD WHICH IS FOUR HANDBREADTHS BROAD, IT IS VALID, SO LONG AS ONE NOT SLEEP UNDERNEATH [THAT PARTICULAR BOARD].

1. II:1: If one turned the boards on their sides, R. Huna said, “The roofing nonetheless is invalid. R. Hisda and Rabbah bar R. Huna said, “It is valid.”

VIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:7

A. A TIMBER-ROOFING WHICH HAD NO PLASTERING — R. JUDAH SAYS, “THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, ‘ONE LOOSENS IT AND REMOVES ONE [BOARD] BETWEEN EACH TWO.’ AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL SAY, ‘ONE EITHER LOOSENS IT OR

REMOVES ONE [BOARD] FROM BETWEEN EACH TWO.” R. MEIR SAYS, “ONE REMOVES ONE FROM BETWEEN EACH TWO, AND DOES NOT LOOSEN [THE OTHERS AT ALL].”

1. I:1: Now we assuredly find no difficulty in accounting for the position of the House of Hillel. But as to the House of Shammai, what is the principle behind their view?

IX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:8

A. HE WHO MAKES A ROOF FOR HIS SUKKAH OUT OF SPITS OR WITH THE SIDE-PIECES OF A BED — IF THERE IS A SPACE BETWEEN THEM EQUIVALENT TO THEIR OWN BREADTH, [THE SUKKAH] IS VALID:

1. I:1: May we say that the Mishnah-paragraph constitutes a refutation of the position of R. Huna, son of R. Joshua in the case of a fence erected on a temporary basis by a caravan so as to form a distinct domain to permit carrying on the Sabbath, if there is a breach in the perimeter that is as long as a standing portion [of the perimeter of the fence, so that the fence consists of a standing part, a breach, a standing part, another breach, and so on, and the breaches are as long in distance as the parts of the perimeter filled in by a standing partition of some sort, in which case Huna said, “It is forbidden.”

B. OR WITH THE SIDE-PIECES OF A BED — IF THERE IS A SPACE BETWEEN THEM EQUIVALENT TO THEIR OWN BREADTH, [THE SUKKAH] IS VALID:

1. II:1: May I say that the Mishnah-passages support the position of R. Ammi bar Tibiomi? For R. Ammi bar Tibiomi said, “If one made sukkah-roofing with worn-out garments, the roofing is invalid.”

C. HE WHO HOLLOWED OUT A SPACE IN A HAYSTACK TO MAKE A SUKKAH THEREIN — IT IS NO SUKKAH:

1. III:1: The stated rule applies only to a case in which there is no empty space a handbreadth in height by seven handbreadths square, but if there is a handbreadth in height and seven handbreadths square, it is suitable to serve as a sukkah.

X. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:9A-G

A. HE WHO SUSPENDS THE SIDES FROM ABOVE TO BELOW — IF THE [THE PARTITIONS] ARE THREE [OR MORE] HANDBREADTHS ABOVE THE GROUND, [THE SUKKAH] IS INVALID. [IF HE BUILDS THE SIDES] FROM THE GROUND UPWARD, IF [THEY ARE] TEN HANDBREADTHS ABOVE THE GROUND, [THE SUKKAH] IS VALID. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “JUST AS [THE REQUIRED HEIGHT] FROM BELOW TO ABOVE [WHEN THE WALL IS BUILT UP FROM THE GROUND] IS TEN HANDBREADTHS, “SO [THE REQUIRED HEIGHT] FROM ABOVE TO BELOW [WHEN THE WALL IS SUSPENDED FROM ABOVE TOWARD THE GROUND] IS TEN HANDBREADTHS [EVEN THOUGH THE BOTTOM IS NOT WITHIN THREE HANDBREADTHS OF THE GROUND]. [THE OPERATIVE CRITERION IS THE HEIGHT OF THE PARTITIONS.]”

1. I:1: What is at issue? One authority maintains the view that a suspended partition validates the sukkah, and the other authority holds that a suspended

partition does not validate the sukkah, in which case it must lie within three handbreadths above the ground.

2. I:2: A matting somewhat more than four handbreadths [in length] validates a sukkah as a partition.

3. I:3: A board a bit wider than four handbreadths serves to validate as a wall in the case of a sukkah.

XI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:9H, 1:10

A. [IF] ONE SETS THE SUKKAH-ROOFING THREE HANDBREADTHS FROM THE WALLS [OF THE SUKKAH], [THE SUKKAH] IS INVALID...[encompassing the entire Mishnah-pericope, 1:9H-1:10]:

1. I:1: What need do I have for all of these rulings ?

B. [IF] ONE SETS THE SUKKAH-ROOFING THREE HANDBREADTHS FROM THE WALLS [OF THE SUKKAH], [THE SUKKAH] IS INVALID.

1. II:1: An unfilled gap of airspace invalidates a sukkah if it is three handbreadths wide, [and] invalid sukkah-roofing invalidates a sukkah if it is four handbreadths. How do we know? It is because we have learned, If one sets the sukkah-roofing three handbreadths from the walls of the sukkah, the sukkah is invalid.

2. II:2: Continuation of the foregoing.

3. II:3: An open airspace in the roofing of a sukkah of three handbreadths in a large sukkah, which one has cut down, whether with reeds or spits, is validly diminished so that the sukkah-roofing is now valid. In the case of a small sukkah, if this is done with reeds, it constitutes a valid act of diminution of the open space, but if this was done with spits, this does not constitute a valid diminution of the open space.

C. A HOUSE, [THE ROOF OF] WHICH WAS DAMAGED, AND ON [THE GAPS IN THE ROOF OF WHICH] ONE PUT SUKKAH-ROOFING — IF THE DISTANCE FROM THE WALL TO THE SUKKAH-ROOFING IS FOUR CUBITS, IT IS INVALID [AS A SUKKAH]:

1. III:1: A house, the roof of which was damaged, and on the gaps in the roof of which one put sukkah-roofing — it is a valid arrangement.

D. AND SO TOO, [IS THE RULE FOR] A COURTYARD WHICH IS SURROUNDED BY A PERISTYLE.

A LARGE SUKKAH, [THE ROOFING OF WHICH] THEY SURROUNDED WITH SOME SORT OF MATERIAL WITH WHICH THEY DO NOT MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING — IF THERE WAS A SPACE OF FOUR CUBITS BELOW IT, IT IS INVALID [AS A SUKKAH].

1. IV:1: If one put sukkah-roofing over a peristyle [covered hall in front of a house] which has door-frames, the arrangement forms a valid sukkah.

2. IV:2: Continuation of foregoing.

a. IV:3: Illustrative case.

3. IV:4: A lath which protrudes from a sukkah is regarded as equivalent to the sukkah so that, if one sits under such a lath, he carries out his obligation to sit in the sukkah itself.

XII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:11A-D

A. HE WHO MAKES HIS SUKKAH IN THE SHAPE OF A CONE OR WHO LEANED IT UP AGAINST A WALL — R. ELIEZER DECLARES IT INVALID, BECAUSE IT HAS NO ROOF. AND SAGES DECLARE IT VALID.

1. I:1: R. Eliezer concedes that if one raised the sukkah a handbreadth above the ground or moved it a handbreadth away from the wall [as the case may be, it is a valid sukkah.

2. I:2: Versions of the matter presented in the Mishnah.

XIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 1:11E-J

A. A LARGE REED-MAT, [IF] ONE MADE IT FOR LYING, IT IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND [SO] THEY DO NOT MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING OUT OF IT. [IF ONE MADE IT] FOR SUKKAH-ROOFING, THEY MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING OUT OF IT, AND IT IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “ALL THE SAME ARE A SMALL ONE AND A LARGE ONE: [IF] ONE MADE IT FOR LYING, IT IS SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS, AND THEY DO NOT MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING OUT OF IT. [IF ONE MADE IT FOR] SUKKAH-ROOFING, THEY DO MAKE SUKKAH-ROOFING OUT OF IT, AND IT IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS.”

1. I:1: Now there is a contradiction in the body of the formulation of the law. You have said: If one made [the mat] for lying, it is susceptible to uncleanness and they do not make sukkah-roofing out of it [M. 1:11F]. The operative consideration therefore is that one has made it for use for lying. Lo, if it was made without further indication of its intended use, it is assumed to be meant to serve for sukkah-roofing. But then the framer of the passage states: If one made it for sukkah-roofing, they make sukkah-roofing out of it, and it is not susceptible to uncleanness [M. 1:11G]. The operative consideration therefore is that one has made it for sukkah-roofing. Lo, if it was made without further indication of its intended use, it is meant to serve for lying.

2. I:2: Tosefta's Tannaite complement to the Mishnah's rule.

3. I:3: Gloss of foregoing.

4. I:4: As above.

XIV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:1

A. HE WHO SLEEPS UNDER A BED IN A SUKKAH HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION:

1. I:1: But how can the bed be deemed to constitute a tent within the sukkah and so to intervene between a person sleeping under it and the sukkah-roofing, when the bed is not ten handbreadths high?

B. SAID R. JUDAH, “WE HAD THE PRACTICE OF SLEEPING UNDER THE BED BEFORE THE ELDERS, AND THEY SAID NOTHING AT ALL TO US.”

1. II:1: Explanation of Judah’s position: Any Tent which is not made by man is no Tent. Cited because of its intersection with our Mishnah-statement.

C. SAID R. SIMEON, “M’SH B: TABI, RABBAN GAMALIEL’S SLAVE, SLEPT UNDER THE BED. AND RABBAN GAMALIEL SAID TO THE ELDERS, ‘DO YOU SEE TABI, MY SLAVE — HE IS A DISCIPLE OF A SAGE, SO HE KNOWS THAT SLAVES ARE EXEMPT FROM KEEPING THE COMMANDMENT OF DWELLING IN THE SUKKAH. THAT IS WHY HE IS SLEEPING UNDER THE BED.’ THUS WE LEARNED THAT HE WHO SLEEPS UNDER BED HAS NOT FULFILLED HIS OBLIGATION.”

1. III:1: From the day to day remarks of Rabban Gamaliel we learned two lessons. We learned that slaves are exempt from the religious requirement of dwelling in a sukkah. And we learned that he who sleeps under a bed has not fulfilled his obligation”

XV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:2A-B

A. HE WHO PROPS HIS SUKKAH UP WITH THE LEGS OF A BED — IT IS VALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, “IF IT CANNOT STAND ON ITS OWN, IT IS INVALID.”

1. I:1: What is the reason for the view of R. Judah at M. 2:2B?

XVI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:2C-H

A. A SUKKAH [THE ROOFING OF WHICH] IS LOOSELY PUT TOGETHER:

1. I:1: What is the meaning of a sukkah, the roofing of which is loosely put together?

a. I:2: Gloss on foregoing: The teaching concerning a sukkah whose roof is made of reed that lie on different levels applies only to a case in which there is not a horizontal gap between one reed and another of more than three handbreadths but if there is a gap

B. BUT ONE THE SHADE OF WHICH IS GREATER THAN THE LIGHT, IS VALID:

1. II:1: But if the light and shade areas are equivalent, it is invalid.

C. THE [SUKKAH] [THE ROOFING OF WHICH] IS TIGHTLY KNIT LIKE THAT OF A HOUSE, EVEN THOUGH THE STARS CANNOT BE SEEN FROM INSIDE IT, IS VALID:

1. III:1: If the rays of the sun cannot be seen through the roofing...

XVII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:3

A. HE WHO MAKES HIS SUKKAH ON THE TOP OF A WAGON OR A BOAT — IT IS VALID.

AND THEY GO UP INTO IT ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

1. I:1: In accord with which authority is the rule of the Mishnah-paragraph?

- a. I:2: Gloss of the dispute given in answer to I:1: All parties concur in a case in which a sukkah cannot withstand an ordinary land breeze, that such a sukkah is null. If a sukkah can stand in an uncommon land breeze, all parties concur that it is a valid sukkah. Where there is a dispute, it concerns a sukkah that can stand in a commonplace land breeze but cannot stand in a [supply:] commonplace sea breeze.

B. [IF HE MADE IT] AT THE TOP OF THE TREE OR ON A CAMEL, IT IS VALID.

BUT THEY DO NOT GO UP INTO IT ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

[IF] TWO [SIDES OF A SUKKAH] ARE [FORMED BY] A TREE, AND ONE IS MADE BY MAN, OR TWO ARE MADE BY MAN AND ONE IS [FORMED BY] A TREE, IT IS VALID. BUT THEY DO NOT GO UP INTO IT ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

[IF] THREE ARE MADE BY MAN AND ONE IS [FORMED BY] A TREE, IT IS VALID. AND THEY DO GO UP INTO IT ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

THIS IS THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLE: IN THE CASE OF ANY [SUKKAH] IN WHICH THE TREE MAY BE REMOVED, AND [THE SUKKAH] CAN [STILL] STAND BY ITSELF, IT IS VALID. AND THEY GO UP INTO IT ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

1. II:1: In accord with which authority is the rule of the Mishnah-paragraph?
2. II:2: If one made a beast as a wall for a sukkah.
3. II:3: Continuation of foregoing: But is there not too much open space between the animal's legs so that the animal cannot form a valid wall?
 - a. II:4: Gloss of II:2.
 - b. II:5: Continuation of foregoing: Both the one who maintains that the operative consideration is that the beast might die, and the one who holds that the criterion is that the beast might flee, will concur that, viewed from the aspect of the law of the Torah, a beast constitutes a perfectly acceptable partition, and it is only rabbis who made a precautionary decree.
 - c. II:6: Gloss of II.2.E.

XVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:4A

A. HE WHO MAKES HIS SUKKAH AMONG TREES, AND THE TREES ARE ITS SIDES — IT IS VALID.

1. I:1: Any partition that cannot stand in an ordinary wind is not regarded as a valid partition — challenged by reference to our Mishnah-rule.

XIX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:4B-D

A. AGENTS ENGAGED IN A RELIGIOUS DUTY ARE EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN A SUKKAH.

1. I:1: How do we know on the basis of Scripture that the rule at M. 2:4B is correct?

2. I:2: Now does the law derive from the cited passage that he who carries out a religious duty is exempt from the obligations to carry out some other religious duty? Surely it derives [not from what served above but] from another proof-text.

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing [I:1.N].

B. OTHERS WHO ARE EXEMPT FROM RELIGIOUS DUTIES

1. I:4: The groom, the groomsmen, and all the members of the wedding are exempt from the religious duty of [reciting] the Prayer, and the phylacteries, but are liable to recite the Shema.

2. I:5: Those who write scrolls, phylacteries, and parchments for mezuzot — they, their employees, and employees of their employees.

3. I:6: Wayfarers by day are exempt from the religious duty [of dwelling in the sukkah] by day and liable to carry it out at night. Those who are on a trip by night are exempt from the religious duty of dwelling in a sukkah by night and liable by day.

C. SICK FOLKS AND THOSE WHO SERVE THEM ARE EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN A SUKKAH.

1. II:1: Tannaite gloss: And [this is the case] not only of one who is seriously ill.

D. [PEOPLE] EAT AND DRINK IN A RANDOM MANNER OUTSIDE OF A SUKKAH.

1. III:1: And what falls into the category of a random meal?

2. III:2: People may eat a random meal outside of a sukkah but they may not take a snooze outside of a sukkah.

E. A RANDOM NAP

1. III:3: Rules governing a random nap.

2. III:4: More of the same.

XX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:5

A. M'SH W: THEY BROUGHT RABBAN YOHANAN B. ZAKKAI SOME COOKED FOOD TO TASTE, AND TO RABBAN GAMALIEL TWO DATES AND A DIPPER OF WATER. AND THEY SAID, "BRING THEM UP TO THE SUKKAH:"

1. I:1: Does the precedent of M. 2:5 mean to contradict the rule of M. 2:4D? We have just been told that people may eat a casual snack outside of the sukkah. What is the point of M. 2:5A-B?

B. AND WHEN THEY GAVE TO R. SADOQ FOOD LESS THAN AN EGG'S BULK, HE TOOK IT IN A CLOTH AND ATE IT OUTSIDE OF THE SUKKAH AND SAID NO BLESSING AFTER IT.

1. II:1: Does this then bear the implication that if it had been of the bulk of an egg, he would have had to eat it in the sukkah?

XXI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:6

A. R. ELIEZER SAYS, “FOURTEEN MEALS IS A PERSON OBLIGATED TO EAT IN THE SUKKAH, ONE BY DAY AND ONE BY NIGHT:”

AND SAGES SAY, “THERE IS NO FIXED REQUIREMENT, EXCEPT FOR THE FIRST TWO NIGHTS OF THE FESTIVAL ALONE.”

1. I:1: What is the scriptural basis for the opinion of R. Eliezer? How does one make up the meal of the first night, if he misses it?

B. AND FURTHER DID R. ELIEZER SAY, “HE WHO HAS NOT EATEN HIS MEAL IN THE SUKKAH ON THE FIRST NIGHT OF THE FESTIVAL SHOULD MAKE UP FOR IT ON THE LAST NIGHT OF THE FESTIVAL.” AND SAGES SAY, “THERE IS NO WAY OF MAKING IT UP. CONCERNING SUCH A CASE IT IS SAID, THAT WHICH IS CROOKED CANNOT BE MADE STRAIGHT, AND THAT WHICH IS WANTING CANNOT BE RECKONED (QOH. 1:15).”

1. II:1: Comparison of Eliezer’s principles in the same matter.

a. II:2: Illustrative case. The butler of Agrippas the king asked R. Eliezer, “In the case of a person such as I, who am used to eat only a single meal a day, what is the law as to my eating only a single meal in the sukkah and thereby carrying out my obligation?”

2. II:3: People may not go out from one sukkah to another, and they may not erect a sukkah to begin with on the intermediate days of the festival [but it must be built in advance of the first holy day of the festival week].

3. II:4: On the first festival day of the Festival, just as a man may not fulfill his obligation to take hold of a lulab by using that of his fellow, for it is written, ‘And you shall take hold for yourself on the first day of the fruit of goodly trees, branches of palm trees’ (Lev. 23:40), meaning, such as belong to you, so on the first festival day of the Festival a man may not carry out his obligation to dwell in the sukkah by doing so in the sukkah of his fellow, for it is written, ‘The festival of Sukkot you shall keep for yourself for seven days’ (Lev. 23:42), meaning, making use of a sukkah that belongs to you yourself.

4. II:5: Remaining with one’s family on the Festival, involving Eliezer.

5. II:6: Story involving Eliezer.

6. II:7: There was the precedent, in which R. Eliezer spent the Sabbath [during the Festival] in Upper Galilee in the sukkah of Yohanan, son of R. Ilai at Caesarea...The sun came into the sukkah. Thinking of avoiding the glare, he said to him, “What is the law as to my spreading a sheet over the sukkah?”

7. II:8: There was the story concerning R. Eliezer, who spent the Sabbath in the Upper Galilee. People asked him questions about thirty matters of law concerning the sukkah. In the case of twelve of them he said to them, “I have heard the answer.”...In my life, no one ever came to the study house before me, I never slept in the study house, either a real nap or a snooze, I never left anybody behind me when I left, I never engaged in idle chatter, and I never said anything that I did not hear from my master.

a. II:9: Same was said of Eliezer and Yohanan b. Zakkai.

b. II:10: Continuation of foregoing. Hillel the Elder had eighty disciples, thirty of whom were worthy that the Presence of God should rest upon them as upon Moses, our master, thirty of whom who were worthy that the sun stand still for them as it did for Joshua b. Nun, and twenty of whom were of middle rank.

XXII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:7-8

A. HE WHOSE HEAD AND THE GREATER PART OF WHOSE BODY ARE IN THE SUKKAH, BUT WHOSE TABLE IS IN THE HOUSE — THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI DECLARE INVALID. AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL DECLARE VALID. SAID THE HOUSE OF HILLEL TO THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI, “WAS NOT THE PRECEDENT SO, THAT THE ELDERS OF THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI AND THE ELDERS OF THE HOUSE OF HILLEL WENT ALONG TO PAY A SICK-CALL ON R. YOHANAN B. HAHORANI, AND THEY FOUND HIM SITTING WITH HIS HEAD AND THE GREATER PART OF HIS BODY IN THE SUKKAH, AND HIS TABLE IN THE HOUSE, AND THEY SAID NOTHING AT ALL TO HIM!” SAID THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI TO THEM, “IS THERE PROOF FROM THAT STORY? BUT IN POINT OF FACT THEY DID SAY TO HIM, ‘IF THIS IS HOW YOU ACT, YOU HAVE NEVER IN YOUR WHOLE LIFE FULFILLED THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN A SUKKAH!’”

WOMEN, SLAVES, AND MINORS ARE EXEMPT FROM THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN A SUKKAH.

1. I:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this fact? This composite contains elaborate secondary exposition.

a. I:2: Gloss of foregoing.

B. A MINOR WHO CAN TAKE CARE OF HIMSELF IS LIABLE TO THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN A SUKKAH.

1. II:1: What is the definition of a minor wh can take care of himself?

C. M'SH W: SHAMMAI THE ELDER'S DAUGHTER-IN-LAW GAVE BIRTH, AND HE BROKE AWAY SOME OF THE PLASTER AND COVERED THE HOLE WITH SUKKAH-ROOFING OVER HER BED, ON ACCOUNT OF THE INFANT.

1. III:1: Does the precedent not contradict the rule [that the minor is exempt (M. 2:8A-B)]?

XXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 2:9

A. ALL SEVEN DAYS A PERSON TREATS HIS SUKKAH AS HIS REGULAR DWELLING AND HIS HOUSE AS HIS SOMETIME DWELLING.

1. I:1: Clarification of the rule.

2. I:2: Drinking cups are to be in the sukkah, food dishes are to be outside of the sukkah. Earthenware pitchers and wooden pails are to be outside of the sukkah.

B. [IF] IT BEGAN TO RAIN, AT WHAT POINT IS IT PERMITTED TO EMPTY OUT [THE SUKKAH]? FROM THE POINT AT WHICH THE PORRIDGE WILL SPOIL:

1. II:1: Clarification of the rule.
2. II:2: Tannaite complement.

C. THEY MADE A PARABLE: TO WHAT IS THE MATTER COMPARABLE? TO A SLAVE WHO CAME TO MIX A CUP OF WINE FOR HIS MASTER, AND HIS MASTER THREW THE FLAGON INTO HIS FACE

1. III:1: They asked, “Who poured [in line with M. 2:9E] upon whom?”

D. VARIOUS OMENS OF THE NATURAL WORLD AND WHAT THEY MEAN FOR HUMANITY

2. III:2: Rain on Sukkot represents a bad omen. Story of master and servants.
3. III:3: Tannaite catalogue of omens.
4. III:4: As above.

XXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:1

A. A STOLEN OR DRIED UP PALM BRANCH IS INVALID.

1. I:1: The authority at hand declares that there is no difference between the first day of the Festival and the second day of the Festival [in declaring that a dried up palm branch is invalid.
2. I:2: Continuation of foregoing. Now the basic thesis on this matter, rejecting the stolen palm-branch on the second day of the Festival, stands at variance with that which R. Isaac said: The rule at hand applies only to the first day of the Festival. But on the second day of the Festival, since one may carry out his obligation with a palm-branch that is borrowed, he also may carry out his obligation with one that is stolen.
3. I:3: When you buy myrtles from idolators for use in binding with the palm branch, do not cut them yourself, but let them do the cutting for you and let them then give the myrtle to you.’ Otherwise these are regarded as stolen.
4. I:4: A sukkah that has been stolen, and a sukkah which one has made by spreading sukkah-roofing in public domain.
 - a. I:5: Story: An old lady came before R. Nahman [a member of the exilarch’s staff]. She said to him, “The exilarch and all the rabbis on the exilarch’s staff are sitting in a stolen sukkah [since they stole the wood from me].”
5. I:6: As to a sukkah’s main beam which was stolen, [and the removal of which would ruin the sukkah], rabbis have provided a remedy for the problem which is to pay the owner the cost of the wood.
6. I:7: A dried up palm-branch is invalid.

B. AND ONE DERIVING FROM AN ASHERAH OR AN APOSTATE TOWN IS INVALID.

1. II:1: Is one deriving from an asherah invalid? But has Raba not said, “A lulab that has served for the purposes of idolatry one should not take, but if he has taken such a one, it is valid.”

C. [IF] ITS TIP WAS BROKEN OFF, OR [IF] ITS LEAVES WERE SPLIT, IT IS INVALID.

1. III:1: The law is taught only in the case of one that is broken off. But if it is merely split, it is valid.

D. [IF] ITS LEAVES WERE SPREAD APART, IT IS VALID. R. JUDAH SAYS, "LET HIM TIE IT UP AT THE END."

1. IV:1: 'Split' means that the palm-branch leaves are shaped like a broom. 'Separated' means that they were parted from one another.

2. IV:2: Tannaite proof from Scripture. The statement 'Branches of palm trees' (Lev. 23:40) indicates that the palm-branches must be bound. If, therefore, the leaves were separated, one has to bind them up.

E. THORN-PALMS OF THE IRON MOUNTAIN ARE VALID.

1. V:1: The rule has been stated that these are valid only in a case in which the head of the one reaches the side of the junction of the next, but if the head of the one does not reach the side of the junction of the next, it is invalid.

F. A PALM BRANCH WHICH IS [ONLY] THREE HANDBREADTHS LONG, SUFFICIENT TO SHAKE, IS VALID.

1. VI:1: The requisite length of the myrtle and the willow is a minimum of three handbreadths, and of the palm-branch is four handbreadths, so that the palm-branch should be a handbreadth higher than the myrtle.

a. VI:2: Gloss on foregoing.

XXV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:2

A. A STOLEN OR DRIED UP MYRTLE BRANCH IS INVALID.

1. I:1: Tannaite proof that a myrtle is required. The composition takes up the Mishnah's topic but not its problem concerning that topic.

2. I:2: As above. If the leaves are plaited so as to look like a chain, it is the myrtle.

3. I:3: As above. A tree with thick leaves is valid, and one that does not have thick leaves is invalid.

4. I:4: As above. If most of the leaves of a myrtle have fallen off and only the smaller number remains on it, it is valid, so long as its wreath-work [three leaves coming out of each nest of the stem] remains.

B. AND ONE DERIVING FROM AN ASHERAH OR AN APOSTATE TOWN IS INVALID.

[IF] ITS TIP WAS BROKEN OFF:

1. II:1: If its tip was broken off but a berry grew on the detached myrtle, it is valid.

2. II:2: Theoretical problem: If its tip was broken off on the eve of the festival, and a berry grew up on the myrtle on the festival, what is the law? Do we apply to the things used for the performance of religious duties the principle, 'once disqualified, always useless,' or do we not apply that principle [that pertains to sacrificial animals? That is, once a beast designated for a sacrifice is blemished, it remains so, even though the blemish later disappears or is removed.]

C. [OR IF] ITS LEAVES WERE SPLIT, OR IF ITS BERRIES WERE MORE NUMEROUS THAN ITS LEAVES, IT IS INVALID:

1. III:1: The rule of our Mishnah has been stated only with reference to [a myrtle which had all of its berries] in a single place, but if they were in two or three places, the myrtle is valid.

D. BUT IF ONE THEN REMOVED SOME OF THEM, IT IS VALID.

1. IV:1: When did he remove them? If I say that it was before he bound the species together, that is self-evident [since the myrtle was valid from the moment at which it was bound, and that is obvious. Rather, it must be after one has bound the species together.

E. BUT THEY DO NOT REMOVE [SOME OF THEM] ON THE FESTIVAL DAY.

1. V:1: Now if one transgressed and did remove the excess berries, what is the law?

2. V:2: In the name of R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon they have said, “They do remove some of them on the festival day.”

3. V:3: If the binding of the lulab became loose on the festival day, one may bind it up in the manner in which vegetables are bound up.

XXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:3

A. A STOLEN OR DRIED UP WILLOW BRANCH IS INVALID.

AND ONE DERIVING FROM AN ASHERAH OR AN APOSTATE TOWN IS INVALID.

1. I:1: Tannaite teaching: “Willows of the brook” (Lev. 23:40) [refers to those willows] that grow by a brook. As earlier, we deal with the Mishnah’s topic, not its problem with respect to that topic.

2. I:2: As above.

B. [IF] ITS TIP WAS BROKEN OFF, [IF] ITS LEAVES SPLIT, OR [IF IT WAS] A MOUNTAIN-WILLOW, IT IS INVALID.

[IF] IT WAS SHRIVELED, OR [IF] SOME OF THE LEAVES DROPPED OFF, OR [IF IT CAME] FROM A [NATURALLY WATERED] FIELD [AND DID NOT GROW BY A BROOK], IT IS VALID.

3. II:1: Tannaite proof for the Mishnah’s proposition on the mountain-willow.

4. II:2: As above: What is a willow, and what is a mountain willow?

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing: As to these three things, their names have been changed since the destruction of the Temple.

XXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:4

A. R. ISHMAEL SAYS, “THREE MYRTLE-BRANCHES, TWO WILLOW-BRANCHES, ONE PALM-BRANCH, AND ONE CITRON [ARE REQUIRED], EVEN IF TWO [OF THE MYRTLE-BRANCHES] HAVE THEIR TIPS BROKEN OFF, AND ONLY ONE DOES NOT HAVE ITS TIP BROKEN OFF.” R. TARFON SAYS, “EVEN IF ALL THREE OF THEM HAVE THEIR TIPS

BROKEN OFF, [THEY ARE VALID].” R. “AQIBA SAYS, “JUST AS ONE PALM-BRANCH AND ONE CITRON [ARE REQUIRED], SO ONE MYRTLE-BRANCH AND ONE WILLOW-BRANCH [ARE REQUIRED].”

1. I:1: Tannaite proof from Scripture for the positions taken by the Mishnah’s authorities.
2. I:2: How do we know that the absence of any one of them invalidates the entire group?
3. I:3: As above.
4. I:4: Decided law.

XXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:5-7

A. A STOLEN OR DRIED UP CITRON IS INVALID.

1. I:1: “The fruit of a goodly tree” (Lev. 23:40) refers to a tree, the taste of whose wood and of whose produce is the same. That must be the citron [etrog].
2. I:2: As above. Just as a stable has large and small beasts, perfect and blemished ones, so among citrons there are large and small ones, perfect and blemished ones.

B. AND ONE DERIVING FROM AN ASHERAH OR FROM AN APOSTATE TOWN IS INVALID.

1. II:1: What is the reason?

C. [IF IT DERIVED FROM] ‘ORLAH-FRUIT, IT IS INVALID.

1. III:1: What is the reason for this ruling?
 - a. III:2: Gloss on detail of the foregoing.

D. [IF IT DERIVED FROM] UNCLEAN HEAVE-OFFERING, IT IS INVALID.

1. IV:1: The reason is that it never becomes available for eating [but remains prohibited].

E. [IF IT DERIVED FROM] CLEAN HEAVE-OFFERING, ONE SHOULD NOT TAKE IT UP:

1. V:1: There is a dispute about this matter between R. Ammi and R. Assi.

F. BUT IF HE TOOK IT UP, IT IS VALID.

1. VI:1: From the viewpoint of him who has invoked the criterion that in the case of the citron it does not become available for eating at any point in the future, lo, to the citron at hand, it does become available for eating in the future,

G. ONE WHICH IS IN THE STATUS OF DOUBTFULLY TITHED PRODUCE — THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI DECLARE INVALID. AND THE HOUSE OF HILLEL DECLARE VALID.

1. VII:1: Since one may not eat fruit in the status of doubtfully tithed produce, what is the reason that the House of Hillel declare it valid?

H. AND ONE IN THE STATUS OF SECOND TITHE IN JERUSALEM ONE SHOULD NOT CARRY.

1. VIII:1: In the view of him who has said that the operative consideration is that, in using the citron, one renders it susceptible to uncleanness, in the present instance that consideration applies.

I. BUT IF HE CARRIED IT, IT IS VALID:

1. IX:1: According to him who has said that the operative consideration is that the produce does not ultimately become available for eating, this represents the view of all parties [to the dispute cited earlier].

J. [IF] SCARS COVERED THE GREATER PART OF IT,

1. X:1: The statement at hand applies only if the scars were located in a single place, but if they were located in two or three places, it is valid

K. [IF] ITS NIPPLE WAS REMOVED,

1. XI:1: If its peduncle was removed.

L. [IF] IT WAS PEELED:

1. XII:1: A citron which was peeled back like a red date is valid.

M. SPLIT, HAD A HOLE AND SO LACKED ANY PART WHATSOEVER, IT IS INVALID.

[IF] SCARS COVERED THE LESSER PART OF IT, (2) [IF] ITS STALK WAS REMOVED, (3) [IF] IT HAD A HOLE BUT LACKED NO PART WHATSOEVER, IT IS VALID.

A DARK-COLORED CITRON IS INVALID. AND ONE WHICH IS GREEN LIKE A LEEK — R. MEIR DECLARES VALID. AND R. JUDAH DECLARES INVALID.

1. XIII:1: If the hole goes through completely, it is invalid whatever the size of the hole.

2. XIII:2: If symptoms that would in the case of a beast render the beast terefah appeared in a citron, what is the law? [Clauses of the Mishnah-commentary are cited here.]

a. XIII:3: Gloss of foregoing.

b. XIII:4: As above.

c. XIII:5: As above.

3. XIII:6: A citron that mice have gnawed.

N. THE MEASURE OF THE SMALLEST [ACCEPTABLE] CITRON — R. MEIR SAYS, “THE SIZE OF A NUT.” R. JUDAH SAYS, “THE SIZE OF AN EGG.”

1. XIV:1: Parallel to the dispute in the present passage is the dispute concerning rounded pebbles

O. AND AS TO THE LARGEST [ACCEPTABLE SIZE] — “IT MUST BE OF SUCH A SIZE THAT ONE CAN HOLD TWO IN ONE HAND,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “EVEN ONE IN TWO HANDS.”

1. XV:1: There was a precedent involving R. ‘Aqiba, who came to the synagogue with his citron on his shoulder.

XXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:8

A. “THEY BIND UP THE LULAB ONLY WITH [STRANDS OF] ITS OWN SPECIES,” THE WORDS OF R. JUDAH.

1. I:1: What is the reason for R. Judah’s view ? He takes the position that the lulab must be bound up, and if one makes use of some other species besides those in the lulab itself, you would come out with five, and not only the four, required species.

B. R. MEIR SAYS, “EVEN WITH A ROPE [IT IS PERMITTED TO] BIND UP [THE LULAB].”

SAID R. MEIR, “M’S’H B: THE TOWNSFOLK OF JERUSALEM BOUND UP THEIR PALM-BRANCHES WITH GOLD THREADS.” THEY SAID TO HIM, “BUT UNDERNEATH THEY [IN FACT HAD] TIED IT UP WITH [STRANDS OF] ITS OWN SPECIES.”

1. II:1: Tannaite complement.

2. II:2: Illustrative story.

3. II:3: Sayings on the preparation of the lulab, with special attention to the handle.

XXX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:9A-D

A. AND AT WHAT POINT [IN THE HALLEL-PSALMS, 113-118] DID THEY SHAKE [THE LULAB]? “AT ‘O GIVE THANKS UNTO THE LORD’ (PSA. 118), BEGINNING AND END; AND AT, ‘SAVE NOW, WE BESEECH THEE O LORD’ (PSA. 118:25),” THE WORDS OF THE HOUSE OF HILLEL. AND THE HOUSE OF SHAMMAI SAY, “ALSO: AT, ‘O LORD, WE BESEECH, THEE, SEND NOW PROSPERITY’ (PSA. 118:25).” SAID R. ‘AQIBA, “I WAS WATCHING RABBAN GAMALIEL AND R. JOSHUA, FOR ALL THE PEOPLE WAVED THEIR PALM-BRANCHES, BUT THEY WAVED THEIR PALM-BRANCHES ONLY AT, ‘SAVE NOW, WE BESEECH THEE, O LORD’ (PSA. 118:25).”

1. I:1: Who mentioned the issue of waving the lulab [that the Mishnah raises that issue at all]?

B. AN ANALOGY TO WAVING THE LULAB: AS TO WAVING THE TWO LOAVES OF SHOW-BREAD AND THE TWO LAMBS OF THE FESTIVAL OF WEEKS, HOW DOES ONE CARRY OUT THE RITE?

1. I:2: Discussion of M. Men. 5:6 intruded for formal reason.

XXXI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:9E-H

A. HE WHO WAS ON A TRIP AND HAD NO LULAB [WITH WHICH] TO CARRY [OUT HIS RELIGIOUS DUTY] — WHEN HE REACHES HOME, SHOULD CARRY THE LULAB AT HIS OWN TABLE.

[IF] HE DID NOT CARRY HIS LULAB IN THE MORNING, HE SHOULD CARRY IT AT DUSK, FOR THE ENTIRE DAY IS A SUITABLE TIME FOR THE PALM-BRANCH.

1. I:1: He should carry the lulab at his own table [M. 3:9F] bears the implication that one interrupts his meal to do so. An objection is raised from an intersecting Mishnah-rule.

XXXII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:10-11D

A. HE FOR WHOM A SLAVE, WOMAN, OR MINOR READ ANSWERS AFTER THEM BY SAYING WHAT THEY SAY. BUT IT IS A CURSE TO HIM.

IF AN ADULT-MALE READ FOR HIM, HE ANSWERS AFTER HIM [ONLY] “HALLELUYAH.”

1. I:1: While [sages] have said, “A son may say a blessing for his father, a slave for his master, a woman for her husband,” nonetheless, sages have said, “May a curse come upon a man whose wife or children say blessings for him [because of his ignorance].”

2. I:2: Important rules are to be derived from the customs relating to the recitation of the Hallel-psalms.

3. I:3: If one has heard [the cited phrase] but did not respond to it, what is the law?

4. I:4: A person should not say, ‘Blessed he is who comes’ (Psa. 118:26) and then, after a pause, go and say, ‘In the name of the Lord.’ Rather, he should say, ‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord’ as a complete sentence, without interruption.

B. WHERE THEY ARE ACCUSTOMED TO REPEAT [THE LAST NINE VERSES OF PSA. 118], LET ONE REPEAT.

WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM] TO SAY THEM ONLY ONCE, LET ONE SAY THEM ONLY ONCE.

1. II:1: Rabbi repeats certain words in the passage. R. Eleazar b. Parta adds some words.

C. [WHERE IT IS THE CUSTOM] TO SAY A BLESSING AFTER IT, LET ONE SAY A BLESSING AFTER IT.

EVERYTHING FOLLOWS THE CUSTOM OF THE LOCALITY.

1. III:1: That rule pertains only to saying a blessing after the Hallel-psalms. But as to reciting a blessing before repeating them, it is one’s religious duty to say such a blessing.

XXXIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:11E-F

A. HE WHO BUYS A LULAB [PALM-BRANCH, MYRTLE-BRANCH, WILLOW-BRANCH] FROM HIS FELLOW IN THE SEVENTH YEAR — [THE SELLER] GIVES HIM A CITRON AS A GIFT. FOR ONE IS NOT PERMITTED TO BUY [THE CITRON] IN THE SEVENTH YEAR:

1. I:1: What is the law if the seller is not willing to give over [the citron] as a gift?

2. I:2: Continuation of foregoing.

3. I:3: Continuation of foregoing: as to the use of wood for heating, there is a dispute among Tannaite authorities.

4. I:4: Other rules on produce in the seventh year.

XXXIV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:12

A. AT FIRST THE LULAB WAS CARRIED IN THE TEMPLE FOR SEVEN DAYS, AND IN THE PROVINCES, FOR ONE DAY. WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS DESTROYED, RABBAN YOHANAN B. ZAKKAI ORDAINED THAT THE LULAB SHOULD BE CARRIED IN THE PROVINCES SEVEN DAYS, AS A MEMORIAL TO THE TEMPLE;

1. I:1: How do we know on the basis of Scripture that we establish a memorial to the destroyed sanctuary?

B. AND THAT THE WHOLE OF THE DAY ON WHICH THE SHEAF OF FIRST FRUITS IS WAVED SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN [FOR THE USE OF NEW PRODUCE, WHICH MAY BE USED ONLY FROM THE WAVING OF THE ‘OMER AND THEREAFTER; THIS HAD FORMERLY BEEN OFFERED AT NOON].

1. II:1: What is the reason for that ordinance?

2. II:2: Continuation of foregoing inquiry.

XXXV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:13-14

A. [IF] THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL [OF SUKKOT] COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH, ALL THE PEOPLE BRING THEIR LULABS TO THE SYNAGOGUE [ON THE DAY BEFORE]. ON THE NEXT DAY THEY GET UP AND COME ALONG. EACH ONE FINDS HIS OWN AND TAKES IT. FOR SAGES HAVE SAID, “A PERSON DOES NOT FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION [TO WAVE THE LULAB] ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL BY USING THE LULAB OF HIS FELLOW. AND ON ALL OTHER DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL, ONE DOES FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION [TO WAVE THE LULAB] BY USING THE LULAB OF HIS FELLOW.”

1. I:1: Whence on the basis of Scripture do we know that a person must use his own lulab on the first day of the Festival?

a. I:2: Story: Father would say The Prayer while holding it.

2. I:3: Tosefta's complement: It was the practice of the townsfolk of Jerusalem to do things thus: One would enter the synagogue carrying the lulab in his hand. Makes the same point as I:1: how zealous in the performance of the commandments various authorities showed themselves to be.

B. R. YOSÉ SAYS, “[IF] THE FIRST DAY OF THE FESTIVAL [OF SUKKOT] COINCIDES WITH THE SABBATH, [IF] ONE FORGOT AND BROUGHT HIS LULAB OUT INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN, HE IS EXEMPT [FROM THE OBLIGATION TO BRING A SIN-OFFERING], BECAUSE HE BROUGHT IT OUT [INTENDING TO DO WHAT IS] PERMITTED.”

1. II:1: The stated rule applies only in a case in which the man had not carried out his obligation with the lulab prior to leaving his house. In that case, he is not culpable for taking it out into public domain. But if he had carried out his

obligation with that lulab, he is liable for violating the Sabbath by carrying the lulab into public domain. Now he has no exculpation since he need not carry out a religious duty.

C. ...HE IS EXEMPT [FROM THE OBLIGATION TO BRING A SIN-OFFERING], BECAUSE HE BROUGHT IT OUT [INTENDING TO DO WHAT IS] PERMITTED:

1. III:1: In the case of a burnt-offering of fowl which was found among other birds and in which the priest thought that the fowl at hand had been offered as a sin-offering, [the priest is] exempt from liability for eating the bird.

XXXVI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 3:15

A. A WOMAN RECEIVES THE LULAB FROM HER SON OR HUSBAND AND PUTS IT BACK INTO WATER ON THE SABBATH.

R. JUDAH SAYS, “(1) ON THE SABBATH THEY PUT IT BACK INTO [THE SAME WATER], (2) ON THE FESTIVAL-DAY THEY ADD WATER, AND (3) ON THE INTERMEDIATE DAYS OF THE FESTIVAL THEY CHANGE THE WATER.”

1. I:1: The rule of [M. 3:15A] is self-evident [and did not have to be stated].

B. A MINOR WHO KNOWS HOW TO WAVE THE LULAB IS LIABLE TO THE REQUIREMENT OF WAVING THE LULAB.

1. II:1: A minor who knows how to shake an object is liable to observe the commandment of the lulab.

XXXVII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 4:1-4

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]. THE RECITATION OF THE HALLEL-PSALMS AND THE REJOICING ARE FOR EIGHT [DAYS]. [THE REQUIREMENT OF DWELLING IN THE] SUKKAH AND THE WATER LIBATION ARE FOR SEVEN DAYS. AND THE FLUTE-PLAYING IS FOR FIVE OR SIX. THE LULAB IS FOR SEVEN DAYS: HOW SO? [IF] THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL COINCIDED WITH THE SABBATH, THE LULAB IS FOR SEVEN DAYS. BUT [IF IT COINCIDED] WITH ANY OTHER DAY, IT IS FOR SIX DAYS.

1. I:1: 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]

2. I:2: How do we know that taking the lulab on the Sabbath in the outlying districts is done on the authority of the Torah?

a. I:3: Gloss of foregoing proof.

b. I:4: As above.

B. THE WILLOW-BRANCH [RITE] IS FOR SEVEN DAYS: HOW SO? [IF] THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WILLOW-BRANCH COINCIDED WITH THE SABBATH, THE WILLOW-BRANCH [RITE] IS FOR SEVEN DAYS. BUT [IF IT COINCIDED] WITH ANY OTHER DAY, IT IS FOR SIX DAYS.

1. II:1: 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?

2. II:2: 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? 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.

a. II:3: In accord with whom is the view taken for granted in the foregoing that the authority of the rite of the willow-branch is only rabbinical and not derived from the Torah?

3. II:4: Blemished priests who may not ordinarily serve indeed may enter the area between the hall and the altar so as to carry out the religious duty of the willow-branch.

4. II:5: The rite of the willow-branch is an institution established by the prophets.

5. II:6: As to the willow-branch, it is subject to a minimum measure. It may be taken only by itself. 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.

a. II:7: 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. He took the position that the matter is simply a custom that the prophets introduced.

C. THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT OF THE LULAB [ON THE SABBATH]: HOW SO? [IF] THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL COINCIDED WITH THE SABBATH, THEY BRING THEIR LULABS TO THE TEMPLE MOUNT.

AND THE ATTENDANTS TAKE THEM FROM THEM AND ARRANGE THEM ON THE ROOF OF THE PORTICO.

BUT THE ELDERS LEAVE THEIRS IN A SPECIAL ROOM. THEY TEACH THEM TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT: "TO WHOMEVER MY LULAB COMES, LO, IT IS GIVEN TO HIM AS A GIFT." ON THE NEXT DAY THEY GET UP AND COME ALONG. AND THE ATTENDANTS TOSS THEM BEFORE THEM. THEY GRAB AT LULABS AND HIT ONE ANOTHER. 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.

1. III:1: Examination of the wording of the rule.

XXXVIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 4:5-7

A. THE RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT OF THE WILLOW-BRANCH: HOW SO?

THERE WAS A PLACE BELOW JERUSALEM, CALLED MOSA.

1. I:1: The place was called Kolonia.

B. [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.

1. II:1: They [willows] were sizable and long, eleven cubits high, so that they would bend over the altar by one cubit.

2. II:2: 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.

3. II:3: In the case of things used in carrying out 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.

C. THEY BLEW ON THE SHOFAR A SUSTAINED, A QUAVERING, AND A SUSTAINED NOTE. 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).” R. JUDAH SAYS, “[THEY SAY], ‘ANI WAHO, SAVE US WE PRAY! ANI WAHO, SAVE US WE PRAY!’” AND ON THAT DAY [THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE WILLOW-BRANCH] THEY WALK AROUND THE ALTAR SEVEN TIMES.

WHEN THEY LEAVE, WHAT DO THEY SAY? “HOMAGE TO YOU, O ALTAR! HOMAGE TO YOU, O ALTAR!” R. ELIEZER SAYS, “FOR THE LORD AND FOR YOU, O ALTAR! FOR THE LORD AND FOR YOU, O ALTAR!”

1. III:1: And lo, in saying, “For the Lord and for you, O altar” [M. 4:5], they will be joining the Name of heaven and something else.

D. AS THE RITE CONCERNING IT [IS PERFORMED] ON AN ORDINARY DAY, SO THE RITE CONCERNING IT [IS PERFORMED] ON THE SABBATH.

BUT THEY WOULD GATHER [THE WILLOW-BRANCHES] ON FRIDAY AND LEAVE THEM IN THE GILDED TROUGHS [OF WATER], SO THAT THEY WILL NOT WITHER. R. YOHANAN B. BEROQAH SAYS, “THEY WOULD BRING PALM TUFTS AND BEAT THEM ON THE GROUND AT THE SIDE OF THE ALTAR, AND THAT DAY WAS CALLED THE ‘DAY OF BEATING PALM TUFTS.’”

1. IV:1: What is the scriptural basis for the rule involving a distinct rite of the lulab performed at the altar? 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].

2. IV:2: A blessing is said over the lulab for seven days but for the sukkah only one [the first day of the festival].

3. IV:3: The religious duty of taking the lulab applies all seven days.

4. IV:4: 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...”

E. THEY TAKE THEIR LULABS FROM THE CHILDREN’S HANDS AND EAT THEIR CITRONS.

1. V:1: 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. 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.

2. V:2: A person should not acquire possession for a child of a lulab on the first festival day of the Festival, for 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 is not permitted.

3. V:3: Parallel to V:1's debate: If one has set aside seven citrons for use [in carrying out his religious obligation] on the seven successive days of the Festival, with each one of them, in succession, he carries out his religious obligation, and then he eats that one forthwith. Vs. 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.

4. V:4: Now how are we, who keep two days of the Festival, to do things?

5. V:5: Continuation of foregoing: 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.

6. V:6: 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.

XXXIX. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 4:8A-B

A. THE HALLEL-PSALMS AND THE REJOICING ARE FOR EIGHT DAYS: HOW SO? 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.

1. I:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know this rule?

XL. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 4:8C-F

A. THE OBLIGATION TO DWELL IN THE SUKKAH FOR SEVEN DAYS: HOW SO? [IF] ONE HAS FINISHED EATING [THE LAST MEAL OF THE FESTIVAL], HE SHOULD NOT UNTIE HIS SUKKAH RIGHT AWAY.

BUT HE BRINGS DOWN THE UTENSILS [ONLY] FROM TWILIGHT ONWARD — ON ACCOUNT OF THE HONOR DUE TO THE LAST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL.

1. I:1: If the householder had no place to which to bring down his utensils, what is the law?

XLI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 4:9-10

A. THE WATER-LIBATION: HOW SO? A GOLDEN FLASK, HOLDING THREE LOGS IN VOLUME, DID ONE FILL WITH WATER FROM SILOAM.

[WHEN] THEY REACHED THE WATER GATE, THEY BLOW A SUSTAINED, A QUAVERING, AND A SUSTAINED BLAST ON THE SHOFAR.

1. I:1: What is the scriptural source for the rule [at M. 4:9C about sounding the ram's horn]? "Therefore with joy you shall draw water from the wells of salvation" (Isa. 12: 3).

B. THEREFORE WITH JOY YOU SHALL DRAW WATER FROM THE WELLS OF SALVATION

1. I:2: There were two heretics, one called Joy, the other, Gladness.

2. I:3: 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. [THE PRIEST] WENT UP ON THE RAMP [AT THE SOUTH] AND TURNED TO HIS LEFT [SOUTHWEST].

1. II:1: Tannaite complement.

C. THERE WERE TWO SILVER BOWLS THERE. R. JUDAH SAYS, "THEY WERE OF PLASTER, BUT THEY HAD DARKENED BECAUSE OF THE WINE."

1. III:1: Now there is no problem regarding the one for wine, which will darken, but why should the one for water darken?

D. THEY WERE PERFORATED WITH HOLES LIKE A NARROW SNOUT, ONE WIDE, ONE NARROW, SO THAT BOTH OF THEM WOULD BE EMPTIED TOGETHER [ONE OF ITS WINE, FLOWING SLOWLY, THE OTHER OF ITS WATER, FLOWING QUICKLY].

1. IV:1: May we conclude that the Mishnah's statement accords with the view of R. Judah and not that of rabbis at M. 4:9L?

E. THE ONE ON THE WEST WAS FOR WATER, THE ONE ON THE EAST WAS FOR WINE.

[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. R. JUDAH SAYS "A LOG [OF WATER] WOULD ONE POUR OUT AS THE WATER LIBATION ALL EIGHT DAYS." 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]!" FOR ONE TIME ONE [PRIEST] POURED OUT THE WATER ON HIS FEET. AND ALL THE PEOPLE STONED HIM WITH THEIR CITRONS.

1. V:1: Tannaite complement.

2. V:2: The pits under the altar, to which the wine of the libation offering flowed had been created in the six days of creation.

a. V:3: "'In the beginning' (Gen. 1: 1) is not to be read 'in the beginning,' but rather, 'he created the pit [of the altar].'"

b. V:4: Tannaite complement on the theme of the pits: The cavity of the pits descended to the abyss.

c. V:5: In accord with whose view does the following accord, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: 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.

d. V:6: When the priests pour wine out on the altar, they stop up the pits.

F. “HOW BEAUTIFUL ARE YOUR STEPS IN SANDALS, O PRINCE’S DAUGHTER” (SON. 7: 2)

1. V:7: “How beautiful are the steps of Israel when they come up for a festal pilgrimage.

2. V:8: What is the sense of Scripture’s statement, ‘The roundings of your thighs’ (Son. 7: 2)? Why are the teachings of Torah compared to the thigh? It is to teach you that, just as the thigh is kept hidden, so teachings of Torah are to be kept hidden.

a. V:9: Continuing the secondary development of the foregoing.

b. V:10: As above.

F. AS THE RITE CONCERNING IT [WAS CARRIED OUT] ON AN ORDINARY DAY, SO WAS THE RITE [CARRIED OUT] ON THE SABBATH.

BUT ON THE EVE OF SABBATH ONE WOULD FILL WITH WATER FROM SILOAM A GOLD JUG, WHICH WAS NOT SANCTIFIED, AND HE WOULD LEAVE IT IN A CHAMBER [IN THE TEMPLE].

1. VI:1: But why [bring the water in a jug that was not sanctified] [M. 4:10B]?

G. [IF] IT WAS POURED OUT OR LEFT UNCOVERED, ONE WOULD FILL THE JUG FROM THE LAVER [IN THE COURTYARD]. FOR WINE AND WATER WHICH HAVE BEEN LEFT UNCOVERED ARE INVALID FOR THE ALTAR.

1. VII:1: Why was the water not used? One should simply pour the water through a strainer.

XLII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:1A-C

A. FLUTE-PLAYING IS FOR FIVE OR SIX [DAYS]: THIS REFERS TO THE FLUTE-PLAYING AT THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING, WHICH OVERRIDES THE RESTRICTIONS NEITHER OF THE SABBATH NOR OF A FESTIVAL-DAY.

1. I:1: How the word for “water-drawing” is rendered.

2. I:2: Tannaite dispute on whether or not flute-playing overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath.

a. I:3: Explanation of the dispute. R. Joseph: The dispute at hand relates only to the song for the sacrificial rite [of the daily whole offering, along with the wine-libation]. For R. Yosé reasons that the principal aspect of the song is the [playing of the] instrument, which then forms part of the cultic rite and so overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath along with the other rites. Rabbis reason that the principal aspect of the song is its vocal expression, so that [the flute] does not form part of the cultic rites and does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath. But as to the song at the festival of water drawing, all parties concur that it is merely an expression

of rejoicing and does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath so that Yosé b. R. Judah may concur with the rule at hand at M. 5:1.

b. I:4: Continuation of foregoing, challenge to Joseph's position.

c. I:5: As above.

I. I:6: Appendix to foregoing: What is the Scriptural basis for the position of him who maintains that the principal aspect of the song is the playing of the instrument? What is the scriptural basis for the position of him who maintains that the principal aspect of the song is its vocal expression?

XLIII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:1D-5:4

A. THEY SAID: ANYONE WHO HAS NOT SEEN THE REJOICING AT THE PLACE OF THE WATER-DRAWING IN HIS LIFE HAS NEVER SEEN REJOICING."

1. I:1: Tannaite amplification: Someone who has not seen the beauty of Jerusalem has never seen a lovely city. Someone who has not seen the house of the sanctuary when it stood has never seen a lovely building.

2. I:2: As above: Whoever has never seen the double colonnade [the basilica-synagogue] of Alexandria in Egypt has never seen Israel's glory.

B. AT THE END OF THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL [THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES] WENT DOWN TO THE WOMAN'S COURTYARD. AND THEY MADE A MAJOR ENACTMENT [BY PUTTING MEN BELOW AND WOMEN ABOVE].

1. II:1: What was the major enactment to which M. 5:2B refers?

2. II:2: Tannaite complement.

C. THE EVIL INCLINATION TO SEXUALITY; THE MESSIAH

1. II:3: With regard to "And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart" (Zec. 12:12),] What was the reason for the mourning [to which reference is made in Zechariah's statement]? It is on account of the Messiah, the son of Joseph, who was killed; versus: It is on account of the evil inclination, which was killed.

2. II:4: The inclination to do evil to begin with is like a spider's thread and in the end like cart ropes.

3. II:5: To the Messiah, son of David, the Holy One, blessed be he, will say, "Ask something from me, and I shall give it to you." When the Messiah, son of David sees the Messiah, son of Joseph, killed, he will say before [God], "Lord of the Age, I ask of you only life."

4. II:6: The evil inclination has seven names..."Joel called it, 'the hidden,' as it is said, 'But I will remove far away from you the hidden one' (Joe. 2:20)."

5. II:7: "But I will remove far away from you the hidden one" (Joe. 2:20) speaks of the impulse to do evil, which is ready and hidden away in a man's heart. "And I will drive it into a land barren and desolate" (Joe. 2:20) speaks of a place in which are found no men against whom it may make an attack.

6. II:8: “For it has done great things” (Joe. 2:20): “And against disciples of sages more than against all the others.”

7. II:9: A man’s inclination [to do evil] overcomes him every day. A man’s inclination to do evil prevails over him every day and seeks to kill him.

8. II:10: If that vile one meets you, drag it to the house of study. If it is a stone, it will dissolve. If it is iron, it will be pulverized.

9. II:11: The evil inclination entices a man in this world and then gives testimony against him in the world to come.

10. II:12: In the beginning one calls the evil inclination a passer-by, then a guest, and finally, a man of the household.

11. II:13: There is in man a small organ, which makes him feel hungry when he is sated, and makes him feel sated when he is hungry.

12. II:14: There are four things that the Holy One, blessed be he, regrets he created, and these are they: Exile, the Chaldeans, the Ishmaelites, and the inclination to do evil.

13. II:15: Were it not for the following three verses of Scripture, the feet of Israel would have sunk. One, as it is written, ‘And her that I have afflicted’ (Mic. 4: 6) in creating the impulse to do evil.

14. II:16: “And the Lord showed me four craftsmen” (Zec. 2: 3): Who were the four craftsmen? The Messiah, son of David, and the Messiah, son of Joseph, and Elijah, and the righteous priest.

15. II:17: “And this shall be peace: when the Assyrian shall come into our land, and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise up against him seven shepherds and eight princes among men” (Mic. 5: 4). Who are the seven shepherds? And who are the eight princes among men? Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Zedekiah, the Messiah, and Elijah.

D. AND THERE WERE GOLDEN CANDLE-HOLDERS THERE, WITH FOUR GOLD BOWLS ON THEIR TOPS AND FOUR LADDERS FOR EACH CANDLE STICK.

1. III:1: The height of a candlestick was fifty cubits.

E. AND FOUR YOUNG PRIESTS WITH JARS OF OIL CONTAINING A HUNDRED AND TWENTY LOGS, [WOULD CLIMB UP THE LADDERS AND] POUR [THE OIL] INTO EACH BOWL.

1. IV:1: The following question was raised: Was the total volume a hundred and twenty logs in all, or did each one contain [the volume of one hundred twenty logs]?

2. IV:2: And [the young priests] were better developed in strength than the son of Martha, daughter of Boethus.

F. OUT OF THE WORN-OUT UNDERGARMENTS AND GIRDLES OF THE PRIESTS THEY MADE WICKS, AND WITH THEM THEY LIT THE CANDLES. AND THERE WAS NOT A COURTYARD IN JERUSALEM WHICH WAS NOT LIT UP FROM THE LIGHT OF BET HASHO’EBAH.

1. V:1: Women would sift wheat by the light [of the fire] at the place of the water drawing.

G. THE PIOUS MEN AND WONDER-WORKERS WOULD DANCE BEFORE THEM, WITH FLAMING TORCHES IN THEIR HAND, AND THEY WOULD SING BEFORE THEM SONGS AND PRAISES.

1. VI:1: Tannaite complement.

2. VI:2: They said concerning Hillel, the elder, that, when he was celebrated at the rejoicing at the place of the water-drawing, he would say this: “If I am here, everyone is here, and if I am not here, who is here?”

3. VI:3: A man’s feet are his pledges. To the place where he is wanted, they take him.

4. VI:4: They said concerning Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel that when he was rejoicing at the celebration of the place of the water-drawing, he would take eight flaming torches and juggle them, and they never touched one another.

5. VI:5: “Whenever we rejoiced at the celebrations of the place of the water-drawing, we never saw [a moment’s] sleep.

H. AND THE LEVITES PLAYED ON HARPS, LYRES, CYMBALS, TRUMPETS, AND [OTHER] MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS BEYOND COUNTING, [STANDING, AS THEY PLAYED] ON THE FIFTEEN STEPS WHICH GO DOWN FROM THE ISRAELITES’ COURT TO THE WOMEN’S COURT, CORRESPONDING TO THE FIFTEEN SONGS OF ASCENTS WHICH ARE IN THE BOOK OF PSALMS ON THESE THE LEVITES STAND WITH THEIR INSTRUMENT AND SING THEIR SONG.

1. VII:1: Have you heard, when David made up his fifteen Songs of Ascent, what he had in mind in composing them?

I. AND TWO PRIESTS STOOD AT THE UPPER GATE WHICH GOES DOWN FROM THE ISRAELITES’ COURT TO THE WOMEN’S COURT, WITH TWO TRUMPETS IN THEIR HANDS.

J. [WHEN] THE COCK CROWED, THEY SOUNDED A SUSTAINED, A QUAVERING, AND A SUSTAINED BLAST ON THE SHOFAR. [WHEN] THEY GOT TO THE TENTH STEP, THEY SOUNDED A SUSTAINED, A QUAVERING, AND A SUSTAINED BLAST ON THE SHOFAR.

1. VIII:1: what is the meaning of this reference to the tenth step?

K. [WHEN] THEY REACHED THE COURTYARD, THEY SOUNDED A SUSTAINED, A QUAVERING, AND A SUSTAINED BLAST ON THE SHOFAR.

THEY WENT ON SOUNDING THE SHOFAR IN A SUSTAINED BLAST UNTIL THEY REACHED THE GATE WHICH LEADS OUT TO THE EAST.

[WHEN] THEY REACHED THE GATE WHICH GOES OUT TOWARD THE EAST, THEY TURNED AROUND TOWARD THE WEST, AND THEY SAID, “OUR FATHERS WHO WERE IN THIS PLACE TURNED WITH THEIR BACKS TOWARD THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD AND THEIR FACES TOWARD THE EAST,

1. IX:1: What then does Scripture mean to say by specifying, “their backs were toward the Temple of the Lord”?

AND THEY WORSHIPPED THE SUN TOWARD THE EAST (EZ. 8:16). “BUT AS TO US, OUR EYES ARE TOWARD THE LORD.”

R. JUDAH SAYS, “THEY SAID IT A SECOND TIME, ‘WE BELONG TO THE LORD, OUR EYES ARE TOWARD THE LORD.’”

1. X:1: Is it so that Judah proposed the phrase “to the Lord” be repeated twice?

XLIV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:5

A. THEY SOUND NO FEWER THAN TWENTY-ONE NOTES IN THE TEMPLE, AND THEY DO NOT SOUND MORE THAN FORTY-EIGHT.

1. I:1: The rule of the Mishnah-paragraph does not accord with the view of R. Judah.

B. EVERY DAY THERE WERE TWENTY-ONE BLASTS ON THE SHOFAR IN THE TEMPLE:

THREE AT THE OPENING OF THE GATES, NINE AT THE OFFERING OF THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE MORNING, AND NINE AT THE OFFERING OF THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE EVENING. AND ON [DAYS ON WHICH] AN ADDITIONAL OFFERING [IS MADE], THEY WOULD ADD NINE MORE. AND ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH THEY WOULD ADD SIX MORE: THREE TO MAKE PEOPLE STOP WORKING, AND THREE TO MARK THE BORDER BETWEEN THE HOLY DAY AND THE ORDINARY DAY. ON AN EVE OF THE SABBATH WHICH CAME DURING THE FESTIVAL

1. II:1: Now the framer of the passage does not mention standing on the tenth step [as specified above, M. 5:4I]. In accord with which authority is the Mishnah-paragraph at hand?

C. [THERE WERE FORTY-EIGHT IN ALL:]

THREE FOR THE OPENING OF THE GATES, THREE FOR THE UPPER GATE AND THREE FOR THE LOWER GATE, THREE FOR THE DRAWING OF THE WATER, THREE FOR THE POURING OF THE WATER ON THE ALTAR, NINE FOR THE OFFERING OF THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING IN THE MORNING, NINE FOR THE OFFERING OF THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERING OF THE EVENING, NINE FOR THE ADDITIONAL OFFERINGS,

1. III:1: Proof that with the additional offerings the shofar is sounded.

2. III:2: Continuation of foregoing.

D. THERE WERE FORTY-EIGHT IN ALL:

1. IV:1: Going over M. 5:5A in this context, namely: “and they do not sound more than forty-eight.” But there is the case of the day on which the eve of Passover coincides with the Sabbath, on which, in accord with R. Judah, there will be fifty-one blasts as specified at M. Pes. 5:7, and, in accord with sages [vis à vis Judah] there will be fifty-seven.

2. IV:2: Further objection was raised to Aha’s proposition that the shofar is sounded separately to mark each additional offering on a day on which there are several such offerings:] On the festival of a new moon which coincided with the Sabbath, the song in commemoration of the festival of the new moon overrides that said for the Sabbath.

3. IV:3: Continuation of foregoing.
4. IV:4: Continuation of foregoing.
5. IV:5: Continuation of foregoing.
6. IV:6: Continuation of foregoing.

XLV. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:6

A. ON THE FIRST FESTIVAL DAY OF THE FESTIVAL THERE WERE THIRTEEN BULLOCKS, TWO RAMS, AND ONE GOAT [NUM. 29:13, 16]. THERE REMAINED FOURTEEN LAMBS FOR THE EIGHT PRIESTLY WATCHES. ON THE FIRST DAY, SIX OFFER TWO EACH, AND THE REMAINING TWO, ONE EACH. ON THE SECOND DAY, FIVE OFFER TWO EACH, AND THE REST, ONE EACH. ON THE THIRD DAY, FOUR OFFER TWO EACH, AND THE REST, ONE EACH. ON THE FOURTH DAY, THREE OFFER TWO EACH, AND THE REST OFFER ONE EACH. ON THE FIFTH DAY, TWO OFFER TWO EACH, AND THE REST OFFER ONE EACH. ON THE SIXTH DAY, ONE OFFERS TWO, AND THE REST OFFER ONE EACH. ON THE SEVENTH, ALL OF THEM ARE EQUAL. ON THE EIGHTH, THEY GO BACK TO DRAWING LOTS, AS ON THE [OTHER] FESTIVALS. THEY RULED: “WHOEVER OFFERED A BULLOCK ONE DAY SHOULD NOT OFFER ONE THE NEXT DAY. BUT THEY OFFER THEM IN ROTATION.”

1. I:1: may we say that the Mishnah at hand accords with the view of Rabbi and not of rabbis vis à vis Rabbi?
2. I:2: Continuation of foregoing.
3. I:3: What do these seventy bullocks [listed in the above catalogue] stand for? “They stand for the seventy nations. What does the single bullock [of the Eighth Day] stand for? It stands for the singular nation.

XLVI. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:7A-D

A. THREE TIMES A YEAR ALL THE PRIESTLY WATCHES SHARED EQUALLY IN THE OFFERINGS OF THE FEASTS

1. I:1: But the offerings of the feasts [M. 5:7A] belong to the Most High and not to the priesthood, so why state that they are equally shared?
2. I:2: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that all the priestly watches shared equally in the offerings of the feasts [M. 5:7A]?

B. AND IN THE DIVISION OF THE SHOW BREAD:

1. II:1: How on the basis of Scripture do we know; all the priestly watches shared equally in the division of the show bread?

C. AT PENTECOST THEY WOULD SAY TO HIM, “HERE YOU HAVE UNLEAVENED BREAD, HERE IS LEAVENED BREAD FOR YOU.”

D. THE BLESSINGS THAT ARE SAID IN THE SUKKAH

1. III:1: Rab said, “[One says] the blessing for the sukkah [‘... who has commanded us to dwell in the sukkah’] and afterward the blessing for the season

[‘who has kept us in life and... brought us to this season’].” Rabbah bar bar Hana said, “One says the blessing for the season and afterward for the sukkah.”

E. THE PRIESTLY WATCH WHOSE TIME OF SERVICE IS SCHEDULED [FOR THAT WEEK] IS THE ONE WHICH OFFERS THE DAILY WHOLE-OFFERINGS, OFFERINGS BROUGHT BY REASON OF VOWS, FREEWILL OFFERINGS, AND OTHER PUBLIC OFFERINGS.

1. IV:1: What does the latter clause serve to include?

F. AND IT OFFERS EVERYTHING.

1. V:1: What does this phrase serve to include?

XLVII. Mishnah-Tractate Sukkah 5:7E-5:8

A. ON A FESTIVAL DAY WHICH COMES NEXT TO A SABBATH, WHETHER BEFORE OR AFTER IT, ALL OF THE PRIESTLY WATCHES WERE EQUAL IN THE DIVISION OF THE SHOW-BREAD.

1. I:1: What is the meaning of “before or after it”?

B. [IF] A DAY INTERVENED [BETWEEN A FESTIVAL-DAY AND A SABBATH], THE PRIESTLY WATCH WHICH WAS SCHEDULED FOR THAT TIME TOOK TEN LOAVES, AND THE ONE THAT STAYED BACK [IN THE TEMPLE] TOOK TWO. AND ON ALL OTHER DAYS OF THE YEAR, THE ENTERING PRIESTLY WATCH TOOK SIX, AND THE ONE GOING OFF DUTY TOOK SIX.

R. JUDAH SAYS, “THE ONE COMING ON DUTY TAKES SEVEN, AND THE ONE GOING OFF DUTY TAKES FIVE.”

1. II:1: With respect to M. **5:8C**, Judah’s provision of two extra loaves for the clan coming on duty, why provide these two?

2. II:2: And [in like manner] they divided the additional offerings just as they divided the Show-Bread.

C. THE ONES GOING ON DUTY DIVIDE AT THE NORTH, AND THE ONES GOING OFF DUTY DIVIDE AT THE SOUTH.

1. III:1: The ones going on duty divide at the north so that it should be publicly visible that they are the incoming group.

D. [THE PRIESTLY WATCH OF] BILGAH ALWAYS DIVIDED IT IN THE SOUTH, AND THEIR RING WAS FIXED, AND THEIR WALL-NICHE WAS BLOCKED UP.

1. IV:1: This was because of Miriam, daughter of Bilgah, who apostatized.

Points of Structure

1. DOES BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE SUKKAH FOLLOW A COHERENT OUTLINE GOVERNED BY A CONSISTENT RULES?

Outlining the Mishnah-tractate supplies a coherent outline, also, for nearly the whole of the Talmud-tractate. The general order of inquiry is [1] relationship of a Mishnah-rule in this tractate to one in some other; [2] explanation of words and phrases in the Mishnah-tractate; [3] the sources in Scripture for the Mishnah's rule; [4] theoretical problems precipitated by the facts set forth in the Mishnah's rule. Most of the composites of the tractate fall into those four categories.

2. WHAT ARE THE SALIENT TRAITS OF ITS STRUCTURE?

The coherent outline just now adumbrated also identifies the salient traits of the tractate. Where we have long theoretical compositions, they ordinarily commence with a given of the Mishnah and raise an interstitial problem contained thereby.

3. WHAT IS THE RATIONALITY OF THE STRUCTURE?

It follows that the Talmud-tractate finds coherent in comments on selected sentences or paragraphs of the Mishnah-tractate, and that the bulk of the comments identify as their point of departure a proposition or an implicit principle of the Mishnah.

4. WHERE ARE THE POINTS OF IRRATIONALITY IN THE STRUCTURE?

Within the stated definition of the Talmud, these composites form large-scale exceptions to the rule that the Talmud forms a sustained commentary upon the Mishnah: I.E; F, G; XIX.B, E; XXIII.D; XXX.B; XLI.B, F; XLIII.C; XLVI.D.

Points of System

1. DOES THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD-TRACTATE SUKKAH SERVE ONLY AS A REPRESENTATION OF THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME?

The answer is negative for two reasons, first, because the Talmud's framers address most, though not all, sentences and paragraphs of the Mishnah-tractate, and also because some large-scale composites are set forth that have no bearing on the Mishnah-tractate.

2. HOW DO THE TOPICAL COMPOSITES FIT INTO THE TALMUD-TRACTATE SUKKAH AND WHAT DO THEY CONTRIBUTE THAT THE MISHNAH-TRACTATE OF THE SAME NAME WOULD LACK WITHOUT THEM?

I.E, F, and G: I find here rules that express principles not illustrated or adumbrated by the Mishnah's statement but necessary for a full account of matters. The positioning is very sensible, since the opening Mishnah-paragraph provides basic rules governing the dimensions of the sukkah as well as its design ("shade must be greater than the light"), with the result that these further governing principles — it must be permanent, not temporary; it must be within a limited circumference, it is valid even though the intent in building it is irrelevant to the religious requirement for which it is built (use by gentiles, women, cattle, Samaritans). So while these compositions do not serve as Mishnah-commentary, they amplify the Mishnah-paragraph's rule and help achieve its purpose. What is surprising is not how many such composites we find in the Talmud, but how few.

XIX.B: Once we have been told that those engaged in a religious duty are exempt from having to dwell in a sukkah, we are given at XIX.B a list of others who fall into the same category, ending at B.3 with interstitial classes, e.g., liable at one point but not at some other. None of this wanders very far from the Mishnah's own allegations.

XIX.E: The introduction of the notion of eating and drinking outside of the sukkah on a random basis introduces not taking a snooze outside of the sukkah, and that yields a separate and independent discussion of the random nap. As before, all we have here is a secondary development of a theme introduced by the Mishnah, not a sustained effort at broadening the program of the Mishnah, on the one side, or introducing facts or conceptions that greatly revise the sense of the Mishnah's rule or even the context in which its topic is represented.

XXIII.D: This item on omens in general functions as those at XIX.B and E, that is, once a topic has been introduced, it is discussed more or less in its own terms. Here the fact that it rains during the Festival is taken to represent a bad omen, and, it follows other omens will be defined. Not only so, but the venue of much of the material in the Tosefta and other Tannaite sources suggests that the Mishnah's first exegetes among the Tannaite authorities supplied the amplified topical program to the Mishnah; the framers of the Talmud, coming at the end, here worked within a received exegetical program, commencing, it is clear, with the Mishnah's own statements.

XXX.B: This entry is introduced for formal reasons; it in no way serves as first-order Mishnah-exegesis for our tractate.

XLI.B: This is a little set-piece unit on the general theme of Isaiah's reference to the salvific standing of drawing water, inserted because of the citation at XLI.A of Isa. 12:3.

XLI.F: The exegesis of Son. 7:2 in terms of the beauty of Israel when it comes for the pilgrim festival, in fact is a topical appendix XLI.E.2, nothing more.

XLIII.C: Here we deal with a genuinely important composite, and one that moves considerably beyond the limits of the Mishnah's program. Specifically, the Mishnah has invited some comments on the "evil inclination," which in this context refers to libido in particular. Then we have at XLIII.C a rather substantial discussion of sexuality. But a second look shows us that the composite concerns not sexual misbehavior or desire therefor, so much as the Messiah-theme. And that theme is not invited by the Mishnah's formulation of matters. The Messiah son of Joseph was killed because of the evil inclination; the Messiah son of David will be saved by God; the evil inclination then is made the counterweight to the Messiah and a threat to his survival. It is overcome, however, by study of the Torah. The composite is hardly coherent in detail, but its thematic program — Torah, Messiah, in the context of the Festival of Tabernacles — imposes upon the topic of the Mishnah-paragraph a quite different perspective from that set forth in the Mishnah itself.

XLVI.D: Like I.E, F, and G, we find here valuable information, though the context is not that of Mishnah-commentary. But I see no way in which the topic of the Festival is vastly recast.

3. CAN WE STATE WHAT THE COMPILERS OF THIS DOCUMENT PROPOSE TO ACCOMPLISH IN PRODUCING THIS COMPLETE, ORGANIZED PIECE OF WRITING?

All but one of the Talmud's important, free-standing composites provide appendices to the Mishnah's own topics. With one important exception, examining the composites that do not serve as Mishnah-commentary pure and simple hardly yields a very strong case that the framers of the Talmud, in their commentary to the Mishnah, have vastly redefined the topic of the Mishnah, imparted to it dimensions not clearly contained within the Mishnah's own presentation, or otherwise given to the Mishnah's topic a character different from that defined by the Mishnah itself. That exception is an important one, and it occupies a prominent position in context. To understand the importance of XLIII.C, not only in size but in substance, we have to glance at XLIII.G. Here we have an invitation greatly to enrich the Mishnah's topic — the saints' and sages' conduct in song and dance at the bonfire. But apart from the enigmatic but clearly celebratory saying attributed to Hillel, I see nothing that strays outside of the Mishnah's own framework. By contrast, XLIII.B explains why the men were located below, the women above, and, when C forthwith introduces the matter of the Messiah, the issue of improper sexual desires falls away almost at once. At that point we are given a huge and complex composite on the evil impulse, the coming of the Messiah, and the power of Torah to overcome that evil impulse. For none of these propositions has the Mishnah prepared us.

A rapid recapitulation of the propositions in the large composite tells us what the Talmud has added to the Mishnah's topic, which is, the Festival of Tabernacles. None of them has

any bearing at all on the topic at hand, but by introducing the set of propositions into the present context, the topic before us is recast:

1. God created the impulse to do evil but regrets it: there are four things that the Holy One, blessed be he, regrets he created, and these are they: Exile, the Chaldeans, the Ishmaelites, and the inclination to do evil.
2. The impulse to do evil is weak at the outset but powerful when it becomes habitual. The inclination to do evil to begin with is like a spider's thread and in the end like cart ropes. In the beginning one calls the evil inclination a passer-by, then a guest, and finally, a man of the household. The impulse to do evil affects one's status in the world to come.
3. The Messiah was killed on account of the impulse to do evil. That is why the Messiah, son of David, asked God to spare his life and not allow him to be killed the way the Messiah son of Joseph was killed.
4. The impulse to do evil is stronger for sages than for others. But they possess the antidote in the Torah: "For it has done great things" (Joel 2:20): "And against disciples of sages more than against all the others." A man's inclination [to do evil] overcomes him every day. A man's inclination to do evil prevails over him every day and seeks to kill him. If that vile one meets you, drag it to the house of study. If it is a stone, it will dissolve. If it is iron, it will be pulverized.

Now, if we did not know that the Festival of Tabernacles was associated with an autumnal celebration of the advent of rain and the fructifying of the fields, on the one side, and also identified as the occasion for the coming of the Messiah, on the other, then on the strength of this extrinsic composite, we should have formed the theory that those two protean conceptions governed. As is common in Rabbinic sources, we treat in one and the same setting private life and public affairs, this world and its concerns and the world to come as well. The private life — the role of the sexual impulse in one's persona affairs and fate — and the destiny of Israel in the world to come and the Messianic future correspond. God governs in both dimensions, the personal and the political. And sages then represent the realm of affairs: suffering more than others from the desires to sin, but better able than others to resist those desires.

The upshot of the one really substantial composite that the Talmud contributes to the representation of the Mishnah-tractate introduces the great themes of the Talmud's system — Messiah, Torah, sage; this world and the world to come; the life of the private person and its correspondence with the destiny of Israel the holy people. The Mishnah's topic, the Festival of Tabernacles, then is situated in that much larger systemic framework of meaning that our sages of blessed memory in the Talmud composed. Knowing the topic of the Mishnah-tractate, we could never have predicted the point at which the Talmud's compositors would vastly reshape matters. Knowing the character of the Rabbinic system, we have no difficulty at all in making sense of what is before us. The Festival of Tabernacles is absorbed into the Rabbinic system through the anomalous elements in the Talmud's structure — as is to be expected.