In the Sanctuary you shall pour out a libation of strong drink to the Lord – (Numbers 28:7). The citation of this verse as a scriptural allusion to the water libation brought on Sukkot is puzzling because it does not refer to Sukkot but to the morning daily offering. One answer offered by Rabbi Nathan is that this verse merely alludes to the general idea of an alternative form of libation, the precise details of which he learns from the allusions in the verses dealing with the offerings of Sukkot (Shita Mekubetzet; see Gevatot Arti).

Rather, it is Rabbi Yehoshua and... it is learned through tradition – (Numbers 28:9). According to Rashi, this claim is the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua corroborated with the opinion of Rabbi Eleazar, that the water libation is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, but excludes the opinions of Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira.

Other commentaries assert that, according to all opinions, the water libation is performed on all seven days of Sukkot. This halakha is learned through tradition, the dispute concerning the allusions from the verses notwithstanding (Rabbi Elyakim; see the lengthy proof to this effect in Dikduk Sodin, as well as in Sefat Eretz). This is apparently the opinion of the Rambam as well, who states that this is a unanimously accepted halakha.

The Gemara asks: However, what about that which we learned in a mishna (Sukka 42b): The water libation is performed on all seven days of Sukkot. Who is the author of this mishna? If you say it is Rabbi Yehoshua, let us say that this ritual is performed only one day, the Eighth Day of Assembly. If it is Rabbi Akiva, the mishna should state two days, the sixth and the seventh Festival days. If it is Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira, the mishna should say that the water libation is performed on six days, from the second day of Sukkot onward.

The Gemara answers: Actually, the ruling of the mishna is that of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira, and he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as stated in a mishna. As we learned in a mishna (Sukka 47a) that Rabbi Yehuda says: He would pour with a utensil that held a log of water all eight days of Sukkot, which includes the Eighth Day of Assembly. And Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira removes the first day from this obligation and includes the eighth, which results in seven days of water libations.

The Gemara asks: And what is different about the first day, that the water libation is not performed on that day, according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira? Is the reason that when the Torah alludes to water, it is on the second day that it alludes to this libation? If so, one should not bring the libation on the eighth day either, because when the Torah alludes to water for the last time, it is on the seventh day that it alludes to it.

Rather, the Gemara retracts from the previous explanation in favor of the claim that this mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua. And Rabbi Yehoshua maintains that this ruling that the water libation is performed all seven days of Sukkot is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, learned through tradition. In other words, this obligation is not based upon a textual source.

The Gemara objects: If Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to this derivation, let him say that it is in accordance with his ruling that one begins mentioning rain from the second day of Sukkot, not the sixth day. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva holds that when that extra reference to libation is written in the verse, it is with regard to the sixth day that it is written. In other words, it is the plural phrase: “Its libations [unsukkhehu]” (Numbers 29:31), which appears on the sixth day, that directly indicates that one must perform more than one libation, while the other two superfluous letters merely serve to teach that this second libation must be of water, not wine. Therefore, the additional libation is performed on the sixth day.

It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Natan says: “In the Sanctuary you shall pour out a libation [hasekhek nesekh] of strong drink to the Lord” (Numbers 28:7). The Torah states the term for libation twice, which indicates that the verse is speaking of two libations: One is the water libation and the other one is the wine libation. The Gemara asks: Why not say that both libations are of wine? The Gemara answers: If so, let the verse write either hasekhek hesshek or nasekhek nesekh, with the same prefix each time. What is the meaning of the varied formulation: “Hasekhek nesekh”? Learn from this that one libation is of water and the other one is of wine.

The Gemara asks: If Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to this derivation, let him say that it is in accordance with his ruling that one begins mentioning rain from the second day of Sukkot, not the sixth day. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva holds that when that extra reference to libation is written in the verse, it is with regard to the sixth day that it is written. In other words, it is the plural phrase: “Its libations [unsukkhehu]” (Numbers 29:31), which appears on the sixth day, that directly indicates that one must perform more than one libation, while the other two superfluous letters merely serve to teach that this second libation must be of water, not wine. Therefore, the additional libation is performed on the sixth day.

The Gemara asks: If Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to this derivation, let him say that it is in accordance with his ruling that one begins mentioning rain from the second day of Sukkot, not the sixth day. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva holds that when that extra reference to libation is written in the verse, it is with regard to the sixth day that it is written. In other words, it is the plural phrase: “Its libations [unsukkhehu]” (Numbers 29:31), which appears on the sixth day, that directly indicates that one must perform more than one libation, while the other two superfluous letters merely serve to teach that this second libation must be of water, not wine. Therefore, the additional libation is performed on the sixth day.

The Gemara asks: If Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to this derivation, let him say that it is in accordance with his ruling that one begins mentioning rain from the second day of Sukkot, not the sixth day. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Akiva holds that when that extra reference to libation is written in the verse, it is with regard to the sixth day that it is written. In other words, it is the plural phrase: “Its libations [unsukkhehu]” (Numbers 29:31), which appears on the sixth day, that directly indicates that one must perform more than one libation, while the other two superfluous letters merely serve to teach that this second libation must be of water, not wine. Therefore, the additional libation is performed on the sixth day.
BACKGROUND

The valley of Bet Hordan – מכתו עזה: According to parallel sources, Rabbi Nehunya lived in Hauran, also called Havan, an area partially corresponding to the biblical land of Bashan, a fertile region in the northern part of eastern Transjordan. There are plains and hills in this area, including extinct volcanoes separated by valleys. At one time, many Jewish settlements existed there.

NOTES

Ten saplings – בַּעַר נְטִיעָה: It is prohibited to plow a field not only during the Sabbatical Year but also toward the end of the sixth year of the Sabbatical cycle. This is due to the mitzva to add a certain period of non-sacred time to the sacred year, as well as a concern that this plowing will help plants grow on their own during the Sabbatical Year. Consequently, a special leniency was required for plowing around young saplings, which need particular care so that they can survive the Sabbatical Year. The plowing of an entire bet ha se’a is permitted only if there are ten saplings scattered throughout the field, not if they are located in a single row.

Willow – תַּכְנּוֹת: According to most commentaries, this halakha is referring to the practice of taking a willow branch in the Temple. There is a requirement to take a willow branch in addition to the willow branches that form part of the four species. Some Gemara maintain that this is referring to the obligation to take the willow in the Temple even on Shabbat.

As Rabbi Ami said that Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Nehunya of the valley of Bet Hordan: The halakha of ten saplings, if there are ten saplings that require water planted in an area of a bet ha se’a, 2,500 square cubits, it is permitted to plow the entire field in the summer preceding the Sabbatical Year despite the fact that it is prohibited to plow other fields starting from the preceding Shavuot; the practice of walking around the altar with a willow and adorning the altar with it on Sukkot and taking it on the last day of Sukkot; and the obligation of the water libation; each of these three is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai.

It is stated in the same baraita cited previously that Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua: With regard to the one who passes before the ark as prayer leader on the concluding Festival day of the festival of Sukkot, the Eighth Day of Assembly, the last prayer leader of the additional prayer mentions rain, whereas the first prayer leader for the morning prayer does not mention rain. Conversely, on the first Festival day of Passover, the first prayer leader mentions rain, while the last prayer leader does not mention rain.

The Gemara asks: To which statement of Rabbi Yehoshua is Rabbi Yehuda referring? If we say that he is referring to the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua cited in the mishna, this cannot be the case, as Rabbi Yehoshua in our mishna said that one begins to mention rain on the last Festival day of the festival of Sukkot, the Eighth Day of Assembly. This indicates that one starts to mention rain from the beginning of the day, i.e., the evening prayer service.

Rather, you will say that Rabbi Yehuda is referring to the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, cited in the baraita. However, this too is untenable, as didn’t Rabbi Yehoshua say there that one begins to mention rain from the time one puts down the lulav, i.e., from the end of the seventh day of Sukkot? This statement also indicates that one begins to mention rain from the evening service of the Eighth Day of Assembly.

The Gemara asks another question: And, furthermore, that which is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of ben Betara: With regard to the one who passes before the ark on the concluding Festival day of the festival of Sukkot, the Eighth Day of Assembly, the last prayer leader mentions rain. To which of the halakot of ben Beitea is Rabbi Yehuda referring here? If we say he is referring to the ruling of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beitea, this cannot be the case, as he said that one begins to mention rain on the second day of Sukkot.

HALAKHA

Ten saplings – בַּעַר נְטִיעָה: If ten saplings are planted in the area of a bet ha se’a, 2,500 square cubits, the entire field may be plowed, on account of the saplings, until Rosh HaShana of the Sabbatical Year. This ruling is a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shevittah VeTzaviah 3:5).

Willow – תַּכְנּוֹת: In the Temple, one walks around the altar with a willow branch, on Sukkot, based on a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai. This willow is in addition to the willow branch taken as one of the four species (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shofar VeSukkot VeLulav 7:20).

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Ami – רבי עמ: A third generation Eretz Yisrael amora, Rabbi Ami bar Natan was a priest and a close friend of Rabbi Asi. They studied with the greatest Sages of Eretz Yisrael and were outstanding disciples of Rabbi Yohanan. Rabbi Ami also studied with Rabbi Yohanan’s preeminent students. In the Jerusalem Talmud, he is usually called Rabbi Immi.

After Rabbi Yohanan’s death, Rabbi Ami was appointed head of the Tiberias academy in his place. Even Sages from distant Babylonia would consult him about halakhic problems. He is widely quoted in both the Babylonian Talmud and the Jerusalem Talmud, not only when he transmits statements in the name of his teachers, but also for his debates with Rabbi Asi and other Sages of the generation. Most of the amora’im of Eretz Yisrael of the following generation received and transmitted his statements. He and Rabbi Asi were also referred to as: The distinguished priests of Eretz Yisrael, and stories are told of their righteousness and sanctity. Rabbi Ami apparently lived a long life as even the Sages of the fourth generation in Babylonia are said to have sent questions to him.
לְפִי
The mention of dew – the second blessing of the winds, it is very uncommon for there to be no dew at all, because its formation is the result of local factors, not the general availability of water. The amount of dew varies according to weather and location. In many areas of Eretz Yisrael, the overall quantity of dew is almost equal to that of rain, and it is only by means of dew that agriculture is possible in those regions.

An excess of dew can damage crops during certain times of the year, which is what the Gemara is referring to when it mentions dew that is not a blessing. Usually, however, dew is a medium of blessing, not only in summer when it is a source of additional water, but also in the rainy season, as it protects against frost at night.

The mention of dew – מִקַּמֵּי
If one mentions dew in the second blessing of the Amida prayer during the rainy season or fails to mention dew during the summer, he is not required to repeat the Amida. This is the case even if he has not yet finished reciting the blessing, as there is no obligation to mention dew (Magen Avraham). According to Ashkenazi custom, no mention is made of dew in the second blessing, neither in the rainy season nor in the summer (Rema). Members of Sephardic and Hassidic communities, and all Jews living in Eretz Yisrael, insert the expression: He makes the dew fall, in the summer (Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayim 114:3).

The Gemara explains: And dew, from where do we derive that it is not withheld? As it is written: “And Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the settlers of Gilead, said to Ahab: As the Lord, the God of Israel, lives, before whom I stand, there shall be no dew or rain in these years” (1 Kings 17:1), and it is written: “Go, show yourself before Ahab, and I will send rain upon the land” (1 Kings 18:1). God stated that He will resume rainfall, whereas He did not say to Elijah that He will restore dew. What is the reason? Because dew is almost equal to that of rain, and it is only by means of dew that agriculture is possible in those regions.
Yehoshua ben Levi was the son of Levi ben Sisi, an outstanding rabbi, and a disciple-colleague of his. In general, the wind is never withheld but perpetually blows. (Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto).

The Gemara asks: However, with regard to winds, from where do we derive that it is not withheld but perpetually blows? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the verse states: “For I make the rain fall, one is required to return and correct the mistake, in accordance with the ruling of the Jerusalem Talmud (Rema).”

Rabbi Hanina said: Therefore, since wind and dew are always present, if during the summer one recited: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because rain in the summer is a curse.

Conversely, in the rainy season, if one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return to the beginning, because the wind blows regardless. If one did recite: He makes the wind blow, we require him to return and repeat the blessing. And not only that, but even if one mistakenly recited: He removes the wind and lifts the dew, i.e., that there should be no wind or dew, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because wind and dew are always present.

It was taught in a similar baraita: With regard to clouds and with regard to wind, the Sages did not oblige one to mention them, but if one wishes to mention them, he may mention them. The Gemara asks: What is the reason? The Gemara answers, as above: Because clouds and winds are constant and are not withheld.

During the summer one recited, He makes the wind blow – it is not withheld, and therefore it continued even during this time of drought. The Gemara asks: And since dew is not withheld, why did Elijah swear that there would be no dew as well as no rain? The Gemara explains that this is what Elijah said to Ahav: Not only will there be no rainfall, but even the dew of blessing, which helps crops grow, will not come. This prediction was indeed fulfilled. The Gemara asks: But if so, let God restore the dew of blessing when He ended the drought of rain, in the aforementioned verse. The Gemara answers: This was not necessary, because the matter is not recognizable, i.e., people cannot distinguish between dew of blessing and the regular dew which is always present.

Some commentaries explain that the lack of dew of blessing was in fact recognizable; Ahav could tell that the curse was fulfilled because the dew that was present did not cause the growth. However, the restoration of this dew was not possible because the rains returned along with the dew. Therefore, it could have been claimed that the growth was the result of the rain rather than the dew of blessing (Rabbi Yosiya Pinto).

The Gemara asks: However, with regard to winds, from where do we derive that it is not withheld but perpetually blows? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the verse states: “For I make the rain fall, one is required to return and correct the mistake, in accordance with the ruling of the Jerusalem Talmud (Rema).”

Rabbi Hanina said: Therefore, since wind and dew are always present, if during the summer one recited: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because rain in the summer is a curse.

Conversely, in the rainy season, if one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return to the beginning, because the wind blows regardless. If one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we require him to return and repeat the blessing. And not only that, but even if one mistakenly recited: He removes the wind and lifts the dew, i.e., that there should be no wind or dew, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because wind and dew are always present.

It was taught in a similar baraita: With regard to clouds and with regard to wind, the Sages did not oblige one to mention them, but if one wishes to mention them, he may mention them. The Gemara asks: What is the reason? The Gemara answers, as above: Because clouds and winds are constant and are not withheld.

During the summer one recited, He makes the wind blow – it is not withheld, and therefore it continued even during this time of drought. The Gemara asks: And since dew is not withheld, why did Elijah swear that there would be no dew as well as no rain? The Gemara explains that this is what Elijah said to Ahav: Not only will there be no rainfall, but even the dew of blessing, which helps crops grow, will not come. This prediction was indeed fulfilled. The Gemara asks: But if so, let God restore the dew of blessing when He ended the drought of rain, in the aforementioned verse. The Gemara answers: This was not necessary, because the matter is not recognizable, i.e., people cannot distinguish between dew of blessing and the regular dew which is always present.

Some commentaries explain that the lack of dew of blessing was in fact recognizable; Ahav could tell that the curse was fulfilled because the dew that was present did not cause the growth. However, the restoration of this dew was not possible because the rains returned along with the dew. Therefore, it could have been claimed that the growth was the result of the rain rather than the dew of blessing (Rabbi Yosiya Pinto).

The Gemara asks: However, with regard to winds, from where do we derive that it is not withheld but perpetually blows? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the verse states: “For I make the rain fall, one is required to return and correct the mistake, in accordance with the ruling of the Jerusalem Talmud (Rema).”

Rabbi Hanina said: Therefore, since wind and dew are always present, if during the summer one recited: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because rain in the summer is a curse.

Conversely, in the rainy season, if one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return to the beginning, because the wind blows regardless. If one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we require him to return and repeat the blessing. And not only that, but even if one mistakenly recited: He removes the wind and lifts the dew, i.e., that there should be no wind or dew, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because wind and dew are always present.

It was taught in a similar baraita: With regard to clouds and with regard to wind, the Sages did not oblige one to mention them, but if one wishes to mention them, he may mention them. The Gemara asks: What is the reason? The Gemara answers, as above: Because clouds and winds are constant and are not withheld.

During the summer one recited, He makes the wind blow – it is not withheld, and therefore it continued even during this time of drought. The Gemara asks: And since dew is not withheld, why did Elijah swear that there would be no dew as well as no rain? The Gemara explains that this is what Elijah said to Ahav: Not only will there be no rainfall, but even the dew of blessing, which helps crops grow, will not come. This prediction was indeed fulfilled. The Gemara asks: But if so, let God restore the dew of blessing when He ended the drought of rain, in the aforementioned verse. The Gemara answers: This was not necessary, because the matter is not recognizable, i.e., people cannot distinguish between dew of blessing and the regular dew which is always present.

Some commentaries explain that the lack of dew of blessing was in fact recognizable; Ahav could tell that the curse was fulfilled because the dew that was present did not cause the growth. However, the restoration of this dew was not possible because the rains returned along with the dew. Therefore, it could have been claimed that the growth was the result of the rain rather than the dew of blessing (Rabbi Yosiya Pinto).

The Gemara asks: However, with regard to winds, from where do we derive that it is not withheld but perpetually blows? Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that the verse states: “For I make the rain fall, one is required to return and correct the mistake, in accordance with the ruling of the Jerusalem Talmud (Rema).”

Rabbi Hanina said: Therefore, since wind and dew are always present, if during the summer one recited: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because rain in the summer is a curse.

Conversely, in the rainy season, if one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we do not require him to return to the beginning, because the wind blows regardless. If one did not recite: He makes the wind blow, we require him to return and repeat the blessing. And not only that, but even if one mistakenly recited: He removes the wind and lifts the dew, i.e., that there should be no wind or dew, we do not require him to return and repeat the blessing, because wind and dew are always present.

It was taught in a similar baraita: With regard to clouds and with regard to wind, the Sages did not oblige one to mention them, but if one wishes to mention them, he may mention them. The Gemara asks: What is the reason? The Gemara answers, as above: Because clouds and winds are constant and are not withheld.
The Gemara asks: And are they not withheld? But didn’t Rav Yosef teach in a baraita that the verse: “And He will close up the heavens” (Deuteronomy 11:17), means that God will stop up the heavens from the clouds and from the winds? Do you say that “close up the heavens” means from the clouds and from the winds, or perhaps it is only referring to the absence of rainfall? When the same verse says: “So that there will be no rain,” rain is already mentioned explicitly. How then do I uphold the meaning of the verse: “And He will close up the heavens”? This must mean from the clouds and from the winds.

The Gemara summarizes its question: This is difficult due to the contradiction between the statement about wind in the first baraita and the statement about wind in the second baraita, and is similarly difficult due to the contradiction between the statement about clouds in the first baraita and the statement about clouds in the second baraita. The Gemara answers: The contradiction between one statement about clouds and the other statement about clouds is not difficult, as this first baraita is referring to early clouds that precede the rain, which come whether or not rain actually falls, whereas this second baraita is referring to late clouds, which materialize after rainfall. These late clouds are sometimes withheld by God as a punishment.

Likewise, the contradiction between the first statement about wind and the second statement about wind is not difficult, as this first baraita is referring to a typical wind, which is never withheld, while this second baraita is referring to an atypical wind, which may be withheld. The Gemara asks: An atypical wind is fit for winnowing grain on the threshing floor. Since this wind is also a necessity, one should pray for it as well. The Gemara answers: Since it is possible to winnow grain with sieves when there is no wind, there is no great need for these winds.

§ It was taught in a baraita: Clouds and winds are so significant that, in terms of their benefit, they are secondary only to rain. The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances in which this claim is correct? Ulla, and some say Rav Yehuda, said: The baraita is referring to the clouds and winds that come after rainfall. The Gemara asks: Is this to say that clouds and winds that come after rain are beneficial? But isn’t it written in the chapter of the verses: “The Lord will make the rain of your land powder and dust” (Deuteronomy 28:14), and Ulla, and some say Rav Yehuda, said: This curse is referring to winds that come after rain, as they raise up powder and dust?

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, since this first statement of Ulla is referring to beneficial wind that comes gently, whereas this second statement of Ulla is referring to harmful wind that comes forcefully, raises up powder and dust, and reduces the effectiveness of the rain. And if you wish, say instead: This, Ulla’s second statement, is referring to wind that raises dust; whereas this, Ulla’s first statement, is referring to wind that does not raise dust.
Sunlight that follows after rain – לִפְּרוֹצֶה קֶרֶם מִקָּטֶר. After a considerable amount of rainfall, the sun's heat will cause the water to evaporate into the atmosphere and be absorbed by the fine fibers of the roots of plants. This combination of water and bright sunlight hastens the growth of the plant's leaves.

The glow (gilhei) of the evening – ﻓﺮﺻﺪ ﻓِﺮﺻﺪ. Some commentaries associate gilhei with yilah, which means to uncover. In other words, the expression is referring to a clear or cloudless evening sky.

For He says to the snow, Fall on the earth – ﻟُبْلَخ ﻟِؤُلُو ﺔـا. Some commentaries explain this verse as follows: And to the snow that falls in the hills, He shall say: Be as on the plains of the earth, i.e., the snow is compared to that which falls on the plains of the earth (Maharsha).

And on a related topic, Rav Yehuda said: Wind that blows after rain is as beneficial to the earth as rain itself. Clouds that appear after rain are as beneficial as rain, while sunlight that follows after rain is as beneficial as two rainfalls. The Gemara asks: If wind, clouds, and sun are all beneficial after rainfall, what does Rav Yehuda's statement serve to exclude? The Gemara answers: He comes to exclude the glow of the evening and the sun that shines between the clouds, appearing only in patches. These phenomena are harmful after rain.

On a related note, Rava said: Snow is as beneficial to the mountains as five rainfalls to the earth of the plains, as it is stated: “For He says to the snow: Fall on the earth, likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of His mighty rain” (Job 37:6). This verse compares snow to rain by means of five allusions to types of rainfall: The word “rain,” which appears twice; the word “shower”; and the plural “showers,” which indicates two rainfalls. This teaches that snow is as beneficial as five rainfalls.

And on the same topic, Rava said: Snow brings benefits to the mountains; strong rain provides benefits to trees; light rain brings benefit to fruit.

And, incidentally, the Gemara relates that which Rava said: This Torah scholar who grows angry, it can be presumed that it is his Torah study that angers him. Therefore, he must be given the benefit of the doubt, as it is stated: “Is not my word like fire, says the Lord” ( Jeremiah 23:29). And similarly, Rav Ashi said: Any Torah scholar who is not as hard as iron, but is indecisive and wavering, he is not a Torah scholar, as it is stated in the same verse: “And as a hammer that breaks rock in pieces” (Jeremiah 23:29).

Drizzle [urpila] – ﻋُرْبِيلاء. Referring to the finest rain, consisting of drops of mist that have condensed slightly but fall softly and slowly. The earth absorbs this drizzle well. Since this kind of rain fills the air, even places where ordinary rain does not reach are moistened by it.

Seed [parzida] – ﺣُرِّد. Phonetically similar to the Arabic ﺣُرِّد, which also means seed.

Torah scholar (tsurva) – ﺔـا ﺔـا. According to the gemara, this may be from the word for fire or heat, meaning hot or one who has caught fire; they also suggest it may mean hardened. The Arabic ﺔـاء ﻢbih, ﺔـاء ﺔـاء, has all these meanings.

And on a related topic, Rav Yehuda said: Wind that blows after rain is as beneficial to the earth as rain itself. Clouds that appear after rain are as beneficial as rain, while sunlight that follows after rain is as beneficial as two rainfalls. The Gemara asks: If wind, clouds, and sun are all beneficial after rainfall, what does Rav Yehuda's statement serve to exclude? The Gemara answers: He comes to exclude the glow of the evening and the sun that shines between the clouds, appearing only in patches. These phenomena are harmful after rain.

On a related note, Rava said: Snow is as beneficial to the mountains as five rainfalls to the earth of the plains, as it is stated: “For He says to the snow: Fall on the earth, likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of His mighty rain” (Job 37:6). This verse compares snow to rain by means of five allusions to types of rainfall: The word “rain,” which appears twice; the word “shower”; and the plural “showers,” which indicates two rainfalls. This teaches that snow is as beneficial as five rainfalls.

And on the same topic, Rava said: Snow brings benefits to the mountains; strong rain provides benefits to trees; light rain brings benefit to fruit.

And, incidentally, the Gemara relates that which Rava said: This Torah scholar who grows angry, it can be presumed that it is his Torah study that angers him. Therefore, he must be given the benefit of the doubt, as it is stated: “Is not my word like fire, says the Lord” ( Jeremiah 23:29). And similarly, Rav Ashi said: Any Torah scholar who is not as hard as iron, but is indecisive and wavering, he is not a Torah scholar, as it is stated in the same verse: “And as a hammer that breaks rock in pieces” (Jeremiah 23:29).